

THE
CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

N^o CVI. JANUARY 1902.

ART. I.—ENGLISH CORONATIONS.

PART I.

1. *The Glory of Regality.* By ARTHUR TAYLOR. (London, 1820.)
2. *The Pontifical of Egbert, Archbishop of York, A.D. 732-766.* (Surtees Society, 1853.)
3. *Liber pontificalis Chr. Bainbridge, archiepiscopi Eboracensis.* Edited by W. G. HENDERSON. (Surtees Society, 1875.)
4. *Monumenta ritualia Ecclesiae Anglicanae.* By WILLIAM MASKELL. (Oxford, 1882.)
5. *Missale ad usum Ecclesie Westmonasteriensis, nunc primum typis mandatum curante IOHANNE WICKHAM LEGG.* Fasc. ii. and iii. (Henry Bradshaw Society, 1893 and 1896.)
6. *The Sacring of the English Kings.* A Paper read before the Royal Archæological Institute in Westminster Abbey on July 12, 1893. By J. WICKHAM LEGG. (London, 1894.)
7. *Three Coronation Orders.* Edited by J. WICKHAM LEGG. (Henry Bradshaw Society, 1900.)
8. *English Coronation Records.* Edited by LEOPOLD G. WICKHAM LEGG. (Westminster, 1901.)

THE study which has lately been made of the ceremonies of the English Coronation has confined itself in the main to their ecclesiastical side. The importance of the structure of the service has been pointed out; the similarity of its arrange-

VOL. LIII.—NO. CVI.

S

ment to that of the consecration of a bishop has been noticed as of no little significance when the theory of the kingly office is under consideration. But, apart from the religious aspects of the kingly office, a wider view of these ceremonies shows that they have retained some of the features of the primitive election of the chief of a tribe. The coronation ceremonies thus still embody the principle that the kingship is an elective office, a principle which has been never quite lost sight of in English history, and which has been brought into play not only at the Conquest, but at the depositions of Edward II. and Henry VI., and still more so at the revolutions which dethroned Richard II. and James II. There are elements in these ceremonies which date in some cases from a time prior to the introduction of Christianity among the nations from which the Anglo-Saxon race is descended. Of these the most conspicuous are the election of the king, and the subsequent elevation on the shield. The survivals of both these ceremonies have been carried out at the coronation of a King of England even in the nineteenth century;¹ but by the unfortunate policy of William IV., which discontinued the ceremonies in Westminster Hall and the procession, the elevation of the king by his peers into his throne in Westminster Hall, which is nothing else than the relic of the raising of the newly-elected king on the shield, has fallen into disuse; and it is to be feared that the three precedents of King William IV., Queen Victoria, and King Edward VII. will be sufficient to sweep away all traces of a custom which may be as ancient as our race.

But though the discussion of the history of these secular ceremonies may be interesting, and even instructive, it is not our intention to dwell upon them. We will rather deal with the liturgical aspect of the coronation; and owing, doubtless, to its complexity and length, it is this part of the ceremonies which has received most attention from the historians. Two sections are to be distinguished; the portion which takes place inside the church, and the portion which is performed outside. Of this latter a few words may here be said. The procession from the palace of the king to the church in which he is to be crowned is the link between the secular ceremony of the elevation of the shield and the religious ceremony of consecration and unction. This gives us another reason for regretting the precedent

¹ Sir George Nayler, *The Coronation of His Most Sacred Majesty King George the Fourth*, London, 1839, p. 110.

set
elect
esta
of th
esta
from
of th
S
after
peer
secu
of E
with
the
king
the
the t
taken
mins
of R
coron
Bish
cessi
rod,
follow
clerg
shrin
in o
right
elect
beco
of G
of L
Order
T
servi
four p
servi
used
perio
and
and t
prop
first t

set by William IV.'s coronation; for while the king is elected and consecrated king in the church by the first estate of the realm in the presence and with the consent of the third estate, the peculiar privilege of the second estate, which elects and elevates the king in a place apart from the other two estates, disappears, and the completeness of the ceremony is marred.

Since then the procession from the palace takes place after the election and inauguration of the king by his peers, it is natural to find that it is rather religious than secular. From the time when the second order, called that of Ethelred II., was drawn up, two bishops have led the king with the choir going before and singing anthems suitable to the occasion. The early rubrics which mention how the king was led from the palace to the church suggest that the clergy wait in the church to receive the king; but by the twelfth century a change towards greater elaboration has taken place. The account of the procession from Westminster Hall to the Abbey on the occasion of the coronation of Richard I. is the earliest account which we have of the coronation ceremonies. There the king is led by the Bishops of Durham and Bath, while before him is a procession of clergy and of nobles, who bear the crown, sceptre, rod, spurs, and the vestments. At the end of the procession follows the troop of barons and earls. The presence of the clergy may be due to the bringing of the *regalia* from the shrine of St. Edward, whose relics they were supposed to be, in order that the prince's kinsmen and others who had a right to these offices might bear them before the newly elected king to Westminster Abbey. The procession becomes more and more elaborate, until at the coronation of George IV. it includes not only the whole of the House of Lords, but also the judges, lawyers, the knights of the Order of the Bath, and the household of the king.

There are seven periods in the history of the coronation service, each of which we will consider in turn. The first four periods are those of the four recensions or orders of the service which are found in Latin, and the last of which was used as late as the coronation of Queen Elizabeth. The fifth period is occupied by the translation of the fourth recension, and the next two periods are those of the order of James II. and the post-revolution order respectively. In this article we propose to deal with the first four periods, dealing with the first three recensions, and also the fourth recension until it

was translated. In our next article we will examine the three periods since the translation.¹

The history of the service which is held in Westminster Abbey can be traced with some completeness from the eighth or ninth century. As was to be expected, our only materials at first are the services themselves. The earliest description that we have of the consecration of a king in these islands is a vague account by Adamnan of how St. Columba consecrated Aidan king. We are told that St. Columba in obedience to the commands of Heaven crossed over to Iona, and after meeting Aidan '*in regem sicut erat jussus ordinavit . . . imponensque manum super caput ipsius ordinans benedixit.*'² But although this gives us no clear account of what happened, the terms used are very suggestive. We may note that Adamnan expressly says that St. Columba laid his hand on Aidan's head and ordained him. This shows how ancient is the idea, prevalent in Lyndewode's time, that the king has two characters, religious as well as lay. This idea receives ample support from the structure of the service. The service for the consecration of a king, as Dr. Wickham Legg has shown,³ presents a curious analogy to that of the consecration of a bishop, and the king is invested in robes which are nearly identical with those of the mediæval bishop. In fact it may almost be said that, with one single exception, the coronation service of the middle ages was, *mutatis mutandis*, that of the consecration of a bishop. The single exception is the absence, in the consecration of the king, of any imposition of hands; but Adamnan is probably alluding to a custom of his time when he declares that St. Columba laid his hand on Aidan at his consecration, and there is other evidence to show that the coronation did include the imposition of hands. But considering the views which were held during the Middle Ages about the nature of orders by such persons as Eugenius IV., we need not wonder so much at the disappearance of the imposition of hands from the consecration of a king, as that this ceremony was retained at all in the conferring of holy orders.

The mediæval coronation services fall into four periods, each of which is marked by a new recension or service. As to the first two, while we have the services themselves in the

¹ The text of the different orders will be found in *English Coronation Records*, Docs. ii. iii. iv. xiii. xxii. xxvi. xxvii. This is by far the best and most accessible collection of services and records of the Coronation.

² W. Reeves, *The Life of St. Columba*, 1857, p. 198.

³ *The Sacring of the English Kings*, p. 8.

pont
of
Eng
is th
desc
V
mod
bish
ano
this
been
and
pray
incre
Midd
ornam
being
first
I
Pont
pont
Britt
in or
recen
does
The
speci
electu
cance
conse
the c
The s
Mass
bened
and i
(Te
qui p
and v
T
while
Here
for th

1 C
2 T
3 N

pontificals of the time, we have no contemporary descriptions of the coronation. The earliest detailed account of an English coronation upon which we can rely with any certainty is that of Richard I. Before that time we have but indefinite descriptions in poems such as the *Carmen de Hastingae praelio*.¹

We have seen that the service of the King's coronation is modelled on the same lines as that of the consecration of a bishop. The kernel of the service is the consecration and anointing, followed by the delivery of the ornaments. To this additions were gradually made, but the general effect has been to increase the prominence given to the consecration and the anointing. Thus instead of the three consecratory prayers which we find in the first recension the number is increased to six in the fourth. The tendency all through the Middle Ages was to add to the service, and each of the ornaments afterwards is blessed before delivery, instead of being delivered between each blessing of the King, as in the first recension.

I. The first service known to us is to be found in the Pontifical of Egbert, the Leofric Missal,² and in an English pontifical which once belonged to the church of Alet in Brittany.³ The similarity to the consecration of a bishop is, in one respect, even more marked in it than in the later recensions, for the service is encased in the Eucharist, and does not precede it, as in the mediæval and Stuart orders. The title is *Missa pro rege in die benedictionis ejus*, and the special service itself is called *Benedictio super regem noviter electum*. This may possibly be taken to express the significance of the service in these early times. The idea of the consecration is not yet fully developed; but the elements of the consecration are certainly to be found in this recension. The service opens with the *Missa catechumenorum*, that is, the Mass as far as the Gospel. The special service consists of eight benedictional prayers, between which the prince is anointed and invested with the ensigns of royalty. The first prayer (*Te invocamus*) prays for grace and piety, the second (*Deus qui populus*) for wisdom, the third (*In diebus ejus*) for peace and victory.

The prince is then anointed by the bishop on the head, while the other bishops present assist in the anointing. Here we may see the idea arising that a 'college' is necessary for the anointing of the king. After the anointing, which is

¹ *Chroniques Anglo-Normandes*, ed. Francisque Michel, Rouen, 1836.

² The *Leofric Missal*, ed. F. E. Warren, Oxford, 1883.

³ Now MS. A. 27 in the municipal library at Rouen.

accompanied by the anthem *Unxerunt Salomonem* (*Zadok the priest*), follows the fourth prayer, *Deus electorum fortitudo*, that prayer which was afterwards used as the consecration of the king and of the oil. It prays that the king may be sanctified by the oil, and that he may in the simplicity of a dove 'minister peace unto his people.' The sceptre is now delivered by the bishops in conjunction with the 'princes,' and a long benediction of seventeen clauses follows. The staff or 'baculus' is next placed in the king's hand, with a prayer (*Omnipotens det tibi Deus*), which consists wholly of extracts from the blessings pronounced upon Jacob and Joseph.¹ The prayer (*Benedic Domine fortitudinem*) which follows the imposition of the helmet is also taken wholly from the blessing of Moses at the end of Deuteronomy.² The king is then acclaimed by the whole people, who then kiss the king, a rudimentary form of fealty and homage which is interesting at this early time. The service ends with an eighth prayer for grace and the help of Heaven. The Mass is then concluded with special secret, preface, post-common, and *ad populum*.

It will have been noticed that there is no trace at the beginning of the service of any promises being made by which the king may be bound. Such an oath, however, is to be found at the end of the Mass; it consists of three clauses by which the king binds himself to keep the Church in peace, to repress wrongs, and to execute right justice. The Leofric Missal adds *Amen* at the end of each clause, so that it is possible that the oath was read out in the church, after the enthronement, by the king, or perhaps by the archbishop to the king, and confirmed by the people. Another point to notice is that there is no blessing of the ornaments, but that the service consists of eight blessings of the king, between which the ornaments are delivered.

II. The second order begins with the liturgical procession, which has been already mentioned.³ On entering into the church the king falls prostrate before the altar during the

¹ Genesis xxvii. 28-9, and xlix. 25-6.

² Deuteronomy xxxiii. 11, 13-17, 26.

³ *English Coronation Records*, p. 15. The second recension is printed in Ménard, *Divi Gregorii . . . Liber sacramentorum . . .* Paris, 1642, p. 278, and at the end of Taylor's *Glory of Regality*, and is to be seen in several manuscript pontificals: e.g. Brit. Mus. Cotton. Claud. A. 3; the Benedictional of Robert of Jumièges (MS. v. 7), in the municipal library at Rouen; the Pontifical of St. Thomas of Canterbury (MS. 67), in the public library at Douai; and in MS. Latin 943 in the National Library at Paris. The order is probably of tenth-century origin. A text with variant readings is to be seen in *Three Coronation Orders*.

sing
the
Thi
pop
this
In
with
that
Chu
acco
said
is s
posi
con
hap
elect
colo

the
and
'cro
king
epis
clau
long
scep
are
of t
In c
accl
how
have
Des
retir
and
of h
the
Chr
clerg
from

1
Deus
2
the
rex.

singing of *Te Deum*, at the end of which he arises and takes the same oath as is found at the end of the first recension. This is followed by the three prayers *Te invocamus*, *Deus qui populus*, and *In diebus*. But a new and important feature of this order is the long prayer with the title *Consecratio regis*.¹ In it the petition is made that the king may be endued with faith, gentleness, strength, humility, and wisdom; and that he may 'nourish and teach, defend and build up the Church of his kingdom.' After the unction, which is accompanied by the singing of *Unxerunt*, three prayers are said dealing with the anointing. The first, *Christe perunge*, is sometimes united with the *Consecratio regis*, and this position seems certainly to be a better arrangement, as it contains no very definite request, but that the king may reign happily, and finally go to Heaven. The second is *Deus electorum*, and the third (*Deus Dei Filius*) is of the same colourless character as *Christe perunge*.

The king now receives the ring, 'the sign of holy faith, the strength of the kingdom, and the increase of his power,' and is then girded with the sword, and then receives the 'crown of glory and righteousness,' the sceptre 'the ensign of kingly power,' and the 'rod of equity and mercy.' Two episcopal blessings follow, the one of six, the other of three clauses. The latter consists of the first three clauses of the long episcopal benediction given after the delivery of the sceptre in the first recension. In the former the saints invoked are the Blessed Virgin, St. Peter, and St. Gregory the apostle of the English. The king is, after these blessings, enthroned. In one copy at least of this order, as in the first recension, acclamation is ordered at the act of enthronement. It appears, however, not as a shout but as an anthem.² After the shouts have ceased the archbishop addresses to the king the *Designatio status regis*, which is the title by which *Sta et retine* is known in this recension. The king is told to stand and hold fast that place whereof he has been heir by succession of his forefathers; and, as he sees the clergy come nearer to the altar, to 'remember to give them greater honour that Christ may establish him to be the mediator betwixt the clergy and the laity.' The service ends with the two prayers from Genesis and Deuteronomy.

¹ The first words of the *Consecratio regis* are *Omnipotens sempiterne Deus creator*.

² The Benedictional of Robert of Jumièges, MS. Y. 7, fol. 169 b, in the municipal library at Rouen. '*Tunc moduletur antiphona. Uiuat rex. uiuat rex. uiuat rex in eternum.*'

At this point follows the consecration of the Queen Consort. In this recension, in which this service probably first took its rise, it is very short. It begins immediately with the unction. A prayer follows, which is remarkable for the phrase which it contains, 'quae per manus nostrae impositionem hodie regina instituitur.' This phrase, it is not unlikely, is a trace of imposition of hands in the coronation of a king, for the transposition of prayers from the coronation of a king to that of a queen was not unknown. The queen then receives the ring, 'the sign of faith,' and the crown; and in the later orders she receives after the crown her sceptre and rod, without any prayers or further ceremony. After a final prayer she returns to her throne.

Mass is now begun. There is a special collect, secret, preface, and post-common, with which the service is brought to a conclusion.

The second recension is the basis of the order of the kings of France and Italy, and is remarkable in that it is most probable that it was composed in England. It is very widely spread, as it is found as far away from England as at Milan; but almost every manuscript in which it is found reproduces the traces of its English origin. This had been noticed in the seventeenth century by Selden in his *Titles of Honor*.¹ The phrases to which Selden alludes are to be found in the prayer which is called *Consecratio regis*, where *regnum Saxonum Merciorum Nordanybrorum* is mentioned. These words occur not only in the French pontificals but even in the Milanese. In addition to these words the saints invoked in the blessing at the end of the service include 'St. Gregory, the apostle of the English,' whose name is also found at the same place in French pontificals.²

The second order shows that the idea of the consecration of a king was fully developed in the tenth century. Not only do we find the prayer *Deus electorum fortitudo*, which was to be found in the first recension, but the long prayer *Omnipotens sempiterne Deus creator* is confessedly the form, as the oil with which he is anointed is the matter, by which the king

¹ *Titles of Honor*, London, 1631, p. 222. 'The next Praier that precedes the Vnction in it [the French Coronation Order] was not only without question taken out of some *Saxon* Ceremoniall, and is almost the same that is before shewd out of the *Saxon Pontificale*, but also it retains still here the very syllables that denote the *English-Saxon* Kings by the names of their owne Territories, as of *Mercia*, of *Northumberland*, of the *Saxons*. The Negligence or Forgetfulness that left those names in it, were almost incredible, if we saw it not.'

² Paris, National Library, MS. Latin. 953.

is consecrated, and by which the clerical character is conferred on him.

III. For the third order we have happily more material than for the first two.¹ Hoveden has left us a long account of the coronation of Richard I. in 1189.² The third order dates from the twelfth century, so we may be on fairly safe ground when we conjecture that it is according to the third order that Richard I. was crowned. Consequently by combining both these sources we can restore with some vividness the scene. Hoveden describes the ceremonies only, while the pontificals give us only the words of the prayers, with meagre rubrics. After enumerating the bishops who were present, Hoveden describes the procession from the king's chamber to the church. At the head of the procession came the bishops, abbots, and clergy in silken copes, with a cross, torches, censers, and holy water. In the midst of these prelates were four barons who carried four golden candlesticks. These candlesticks are a feature peculiar, so far as we know, to the coronation of Richard I. Behind the clergy came the lords who carried the *regalia*. The first is Godfrey de Lucy, who bears the king's cap. With him is John Marshal with the royal spurs. Behind them comes another couple—the Earl of Strigul carrying the sceptre with the cross, and the Earl of Salisbury bearing the rod with the dove. The next line of the procession is composed of three nobles carrying swords: in the centre is John, Count of Mortain, the Duke of Normandy's brother; on the one hand is the Earl of Huntingdon, David, the King of Scots' brother, on the other hand is the Earl of Leicester. Then follow six earls and barons carrying 'unum scaccarium magnum valde,' on which are placed the royal vestments, while immediately behind is the Earl of Albemarle carrying the crown. 'Richard, Duke of Normandy,' supported by the bishops of Durham and Bath, and under a canopy borne by four barons, follows, while the procession is closed by the crowd of nobles and earls and others who came to see the sight.

On entering into the church Richard took the oath, which was still the same as that of the first recension, and the order itself then prescribes that the election take place, after which

¹ The third order itself is printed in 'Liber Pontificalis Chr. Bainbridge,' *English Coronation Records*, p. 30, and may be found in the manuscript pontifical at Magdalen College, Oxford.

² *Chronica Magistri Rogeri de Hoveden*, ed. W. Stubbs, Rolls Series, ii. 1870, iii. 9.

the archbishop said three consecratory prayers. The first is the *Consecratio regis* of the second recension (*Omnipotens sempiterne Deus creator*). This was followed by a prayer, *Benedic Domine hunc regem*, which is a shortened form of the long episcopal benediction delivered in the first recension after the delivery of the sceptre. It is longer than its meagre representative in the second recension, and it will be noticed that its form has somewhat changed. It is not divided now into clauses each ending with a response of *Amen*, but it is a continuous prayer. Some of the remaining clauses of the original benediction appear in the third prayer, *Deus ineffabilis auctor*, which, like its predecessor, prays for the general welfare of king and people. They are scarcely consecratory prayers in the sense of *Omnipotens sempiterne Deus creator*; they are rather prayers for the good estate of the king.

The chronicler says that Richard was then stripped of all his clothes except his shirt and breeches, the former of which was torn open at the shoulders, and the royal buskins of cloth of gold were put on.

The archbishop, saying the formula *Ungantur manus istae*, then anointed the king's hands. Another blessing was then invoked (*Prospice omnipotens Deus*), and the head and breast afterwards anointed. The unction in three places, says the chronicler (and this opinion was also held by St. Thomas of Canterbury), signified glory, knowledge, and courage. The anthem which accompanies unction in this recension is not *Unxerunt*, which is found in all the other services from the earliest down to Queen Victoria's, but *Deum time*, after which the prayers *Deus Dei Filius* and *Deus qui es justorum gloria* bring this division of the service to a close.

After he had been anointed, King Richard received a linen coif, which was placed on his head, and also the royal cap which had been carried by Godfrey de Lucy. He was then invested with the tunic, dalmatic, sword (to repress evil doers against the Church), spurs, and *pallium*. The service says that after the sword he was to receive the armil, but the chroniclers do not mention it. Then followed a curious episode. We are told that the archbishop straitly charged him in the name of God not to take this great office upon him unless he intended to keep inviolate his oath. A similar episode also occurred at King John's coronation. What is interesting is that the incident should have taken place at this point. Had it taken place before unction it might have been considered as an effective check, but it seems weak to try and bind the king after the unction. It may be that in

the long series of different events during the service the narrator has become confused, as indeed very often happened,¹ and has misplaced the incident; but it is instructive to note that he has placed this second oath immediately before the act of crowning, which, in the seventeenth century, was to become the important act of the service. At any rate this second oath does not appear in the order for the service itself, and it is not unlikely that if it really took place it was of the nature of a private agreement between the king and the archbishop.

The king is then said to have taken the crown from the altar with his own hands, and to have given it to the archbishop, who doubtless blessed it with the formula *Deus tuorum corona fidelium*, and placed it on the king's head, saying *Coronet te Deus corona gloriæ atque justitiæ*; while two earls held it up, on account of its weight. The archbishop now delivered the ring, the sceptre with the cross into the king's right hand, and the rod with the dove into his left, and pronounced the blessing *Benedicat tibi Deus*. After *Te Deum*, which followed, the king, supported by the bishops of Durham and Bath, and preceded by the torchbearers and the swords, was enthroned by the archbishop, who addressed to him *Sta et retine*.

Mass of the Sunday was then said, and at the offertory the king presented a mark of gold, the oblation, says the chronicler, that a king must make at all his coronations. After Mass, the king, with the same pomp as before, and invested with the royal insignia, was led back to his palace, where he was divested of the *regalia* and assumed lighter ornaments; after which he sat down to a banquet, which was marked by incidents which the Jewish community in England had cause to remember for some time, as the conversion and immediate relapse of a Jew was the signal for a general massacre.

When we compare the account of this coronation with those of later times, there are three details, besides the second oath, which come chiefly to our notice. In the first place, the time at which the buskins and sandals are delivered is quite different from that in the later orders. In the later recensions these ornaments are not delivered till after unction: here they are given when the king is divested of his robes preparatory to unction. If we are not dealing with an error in the account, it is an interesting detail, for it was at this point in the service that the buskins were delivered in

¹ See, for example, Pepys' account of the coronation of Charles II. (*Diary*, ed. Henry B. Wheatley, London, 1893, ii. 17 sqq.)

the French order, and it may have been that in the previous recension the buskins were delivered at this place, and that the tradition remained during the period of the third recension. Like the position of *Te Deum*, at the beginning of the service,¹ in the second recension, the delivery of the buskins before unction is open to criticism, as an arrangement is unsatisfactory by which part of the clerical vestments are put on before the completion of the consecration by unction.

In the second place, we may notice that, in addition to the coif, the royal cap was placed on the king's head. We are not told of what material this cap was made. If it was of linen, it would be possibly a relic of the amice, one of the episcopal vestments, which does not appear among the *regalia*. The coif by which the oil was protected remained in the later recensions, and the comparison of it to the amice is very tempting; but it is much more likely that with the linen gloves its ancestor is the bands of linen which are put upon the bishop's head and hands to protect the places anointed.

All the other episcopal vestments, with which the sovereign is adorned, except the gloves, which appear later, are mentioned in this description. The first vestment put on after unction is called 'tunica,' and from the later accounts it appears to have been of linen. In the inventory taken in 1220, we find among the *regalia* of King John a 'tunica' of white diaper. The colour, the name, and the material of the vestment remind us forcibly of the albe of the bishop. The king had already received the buskins and sandals; and above the albe, or, as it was called later, the *colobium sindonis*, the king was clothed in a dalmatic, of which the inventory of 1220 mentions two, one of King John and the other of Henry III., both of red samite. This vestment, which was sometimes doubled, corresponds to the tunicle and dalmatic of a bishop. With this vestment was also given the armil, which is a stol-shaped vestment, which the king wore, and still wears, like a bishop—that is, not crossed over his breast, but pendent from the neck. Then follows the *pallium regale*, or, as it is called by Hoveden, the *mantea*. This vestment was square, and in the fourteenth century was clasped together at the breast in manner of a cope. It was, and is still, all embroidered with golden eagles, the symbol of the empire of England. This robe is the cope, or, what is really the same vestment, the chasuble of the bishop; and the King of

¹ The position of *Te Deum* in the second recension may perhaps be explained as an act of thanksgiving for the election of the king in the royal palace.

France, who also wore the episcopal robes, received a vestment which was called a *soccus*, and was shaped like a chasuble, save that for convenience it was opened so as to be clasped on the shoulder. Besides the sword and sceptre, which are the ensigns rather of a king than of a bishop, the king, like a bishop, also receives ring, staff or rod, and crown, which corresponds to the mitre of the bishop.

The third point to notice is the absence of any acclamation, except the electing *Volumus et concedimus*, at the very outset of the service. There is no acclamation at the act of coronation, and apparently none at the inthronization. This latter act was evidently carried out with some solemnity, for the chronicler recites the officers attendant on the king, and uses language from which we can infer that a procession formed part of the ceremony. The third recension is the earliest in which there is no trace at all of acclamation; though in the second recension the words *Vivat rex* appear as an anthem, not a shout. The presence of acclamation at this point in the seventeenth century, when it next appears, makes it probable that the acclamation at inthronization was a matter of tradition, which was always carried out.

The case for acclamation at the crowning is different. Students of mediæval coronations will notice that in the different English orders and accounts the act of coronation is passed by with no more notice than the delivery of other ornaments. The reason is that just as the crown corresponds to the mitre, so there is no more reason to acclaim the delivery of this ornament than the delivery, for example, of the rod with the dove. The two most striking parts of the service were the anointing and the inthronization, which was the completion and final act of a ceremony, begun by the peers in the king's palace, and continued, on their part, by the clergy in the church.

In the Red Book of the Exchequer¹ there is a description of the coronation of Queen Eleanor of Provence, the service for which must have been carried out according to the third recension. The service itself does not call for much remark. The title announces that it is *secundum ordinem Romanum*; and four of the prayers used are those for the coronation of an empress at Rome. The most remarkable, seeing that it only occurs in this recension, is the prayer *Spiritus sancti gratia*. This prayer, which was commonly used at Rome, and in Germany, at the consecration of

¹ The *Red Book of the Exchequer*, ed. Hubert Hall, Rolls Series, xcix. 1896, ii. 755.

princes and princesses, is a petition that inward grace may be conferred by the outward anointing. Besides the Roman prayers (which are the consecration, *Omnipotens sempiterne Deus fons et origo*, said at the entrance to the church; *Deus qui solus habes immortalitatem*, a prayer for chastity, to be said before the altar; *Spiritus sancti gratia* and *Officio indignitatis nostrae*, which is said after coronation),¹ the old prayers of the second recension are still retained. Further, a prayer blessing the crown said before the coronation of the king has crept into the corresponding place in the coronation of the queen.

The Red Book of the Exchequer gives us an account of the procession, but no details about the service in the church. There are a few changes to be noted from the account of Richard I.'s procession. Instead of four barons holding a canopy over the king, the office is performed by sixteen barons of the Cinque Ports, who ever since have been privileged to perform this service. Another canopy similar to the king's in all respects was carried over the queen. It was of purple silk carried on silver staves, with silver gilt bells at the corners. The king had been already crowned, but in honour of the occasion he wore his crown and the *regalia* were carried before him. Before the king also the chancellor and treasurer carry the stone chalice and the paten of St. Edward, and the middle sword of the three which appeared at Richard I.'s coronation is mentioned by its name *Curtana*.

The third recension marks the infusion of a new element into the coronation service. There are no less than six new prayers and formulæ, while the words said at the delivery of the sword and ring have been considerably changed. The formulæ at the delivery of the armil and pall are a new feature in the service, and though the amount of new work is large, the order for the king's consecration is more meagre than the second recension. The omissions are very remarkable, and include, among others, such prayers as *Te invocamus*, *In diebus ejus*, and the anthem *Confortare et esto vir*. The Biblical benedictions at the end are omitted, no provision is made for a coronation Mass, and it is noticeable, in connexion with this feature, that the Mass sung after Richard I.'s coronation was not a special Mass, but the Mass of the Sunday.

Whence the new element came it is difficult to determine.

¹ See Melchior Hittorp, *De divinis Catholice Ecclesie Ritibus*, Paris, 1610, col. 152.

The order itself bears a strong resemblance to that in Hittorp's '*Ordo Romanus*'¹; and the title of the queen's coronation expressly suggests a Roman origin. But without going so far as to say that the order is Roman, we can fairly conjecture that it is foreign; and when we remember the strength of foreign influences, not only in the crown of England under the Norman kings and the early Plantagenets but also in the archbishopric of Canterbury, when it was held by such men as Lanfranc and St. Anselm, we cannot be surprised at finding traces of a foreign or Italian element in the coronation service at this time.

IV. The third recension lasted from the twelfth century to the end of the thirteenth, and Edward I. was probably the last sovereign to be crowned according to it. A new order was used at the coronation of Edward II., an order which was remarkable for its length, its completeness, and the clearness of its arrangement. Under it the coronation of the English kings was attended by a splendour which it has received under no other recension. It lasted for a long period, from Edward II.'s coronation in 1307 to the coronation of Charles II. in 1661. In 1603 it was translated, but the service is the same in every respect save the language. The rubrics of the service were to undergo a revision a few years after its first use, but only to make the directions as complete as possible. It is not our intention in this article to carry the history of this recension down to the coronation of Charles II., but rather to stop at the coronation of James I., the king under whom the service was translated.

The materials that we have for the study of this recension are especially numerous: for besides various descriptions there are several examples of the order. The most famous, perhaps, are the two manuscripts which have the revised rubrics, and which are both in the custody of the Dean of Westminster: namely, the *Liber regalis*, and the copy of this in Abbot Litlington's missal for the use of Westminster, which has been recently edited by Dr. Wickham Legg. Two copies are known of the early edition of the fourth recension: the one is in the British Museum,² and the other is in the Rawlinson collection in the Bodleian Library.³ The rubrics of these manuscripts begin their directions with the elevation of the king by his peers in Westminster Hall. Another copy of the fourth recension, in the University Library at

¹ Melchior Hittorp, *De divinis Catholicæ Ecclesiæ Ritibus*.

² Harl. MS. 2901.

³ Rawl. MS. C. 425.

Cambridge¹ has a number of rubrics which differ in many important respects from the short rubrics of the other two manuscripts. The rubrics, for example, direct that the elevation in Westminster Hall shall be carried out by the second estate alone, while the first estate is to remain in the church until the election in Westminster Hall is completed. Four nobles then announce to the clergy the result of the election in the king's palace, and ask that the king they have elected may be consecrated. This illustrates very clearly what we pointed out at the beginning of our article, that the business in Westminster Hall is the election by the second estate, while that in Westminster Abbey is the business of the first estate.

But when the rubrics were revised for the coronation of Richard II., a great addition had been made to the ceremonies. These begin, not on the day of the coronation, but the evening before, when the king, attended by his nobles, rode from the Tower of London to Westminster. The processions and other rites are very fully described in a document entitled '*A Little Device for the coronation of the most high and mighty christian prince Henry the seventh*,'² which was originally drawn up for Richard III., and which was also drafted for Henry VIII.'s coronation. It describes how on the morning of the day before the coronation the king in the Tower made knights of the Bath, and in the afternoon, preceded by the lords temporal, the mayor and aldermen of London, heralds at arms and 'minstrels,' rode through the town, followed by the queen in a magnificent litter, '*plebi occurrenti se offerens intuendum*.' In theory this was the king's first appearance in public, and in it he showed himself to the people as their future prince.

On arriving at Westminster there was a ceremony in Westminster Hall called the 'void,' in which the king and his nobles partook of spice and wine.

The next morning, the day of the coronation, the king was clothed in his shirt and tunic, which had slits at the places for the anointing: over these he wore a parliament robe, and then, followed by the queen, he took his seat in Westminster Hall, surrounded by his prelates as well as his

¹ Mm. 3. 21. This manuscript is that which Mr. Maskell used for his edition of the Latin coronation service in *Monumenta Ritualia*.

² *Rutland Papers*, ed. W. Jerdan, Camden Society, 1842. It describes the coronation of Henry VII.'s queen, though as a matter of history the queen's coronation did not take place till more than two years after the king's. See also *English Coronation Records*, Doc. xx.

noble
or tw

T

regal

lords

most

the ra

is the

assign

coron

of thi

a num

was d

H

and E

to pe

judgm

to sup

would

coron

queen

bishop

are ca

purple

each o

W

the p

prayer

cession

which

The a

if the

shouts

King

On

oblati

pound

with c

himself

said.

Edward

finger.

nobles. The queen also had her seat there, but it was a step or two lower than the king's.

The abbot and convent of Westminster then bring the *regalia* from the abbey. The *regalia* are then given to the lords who are to carry them, and the procession, which is in most respects similar to that of Richard I., moves forward on the ray cloth, laid by the lord of the manor of Bedford, who is the almoner for the day. This duty had already been assigned to the lord of that manor at Queen Eleanor's coronation. The cloth was striped or 'ray'; and the origin of this design was doubtless the variegated pattern caused by a number of different cloths when spread along the way, as was done at Richard I.'s coronation.

Henry VII. was not supported by the bishops of Durham and Bath, though nobody seems to have disputed their right to perform the office. At Edward VI.'s coronation the judgment on the claim of the bishops of Durham and Bath to support the king was reserved,¹ and as only one bishop would take part in the ceremony at Queen Elizabeth's coronation, the queen was supported by two earls.² The queen, who follows the king, is also supported by two bishops, while before her her crown, sceptre, and ivory rod are carried. Over the king and queen are held canopies of purple damask by barons of the Cinque Ports, sixteen to each canopy.

When the queen arrives at the west door of the church the procession halts, and the archbishop says over her the prayer, *Omnipotens sempiterne Deus fons*. After this the procession moves forward to the elevated platform, or 'theatre,' which is set up at the crossing of the transepts and choir. The archbishop then shows the king to the people, and asks if they would have him as their king; they answer with shouts of 'Yea, yea, yea, so be it, King Henry, King Henry, King Henry!'

One of the new features of the fourth recension is the first oblation, in which the king and queen offer a pall and a pound of gold. Before this is done the pavement is strewn with carpets and cushions, on which the king may prostrate himself. After the oblation, the prayer *Deus humilium* is said. The ingot or wedge of gold which was offered by Edward II. was the figure of a man stretching forth his finger. This was an allusion to the story that the ring of

¹ Brit. Mus. Stowe MS. 579.

² *Calendar of State Papers, Venetian, 1558-80*, p. 18.

Edward the Confessor was given by St. John the Evangelist to some English pilgrims in Palestine.

The sermon is now delivered, and is followed by the oath, the form of which has undergone a complete change from that of the oath in the earlier orders. It is now no longer a promissory statement, but an examination by the archbishop, in the same way as a candidate for episcopal consecration is examined by the metropolitan. The archbishop asks the king if he will keep the laws of the country, and especially the laws of St. Edward; if he will defend the Church; if he will be just in his judgments; and if he will uphold the laws which the people shall choose. One of the bishops then asks if the king will defend the privileges of the bishops and abbots; and, after promising to do this, the king confirms his promises by an oath taken on the altar, and also upon the Sacrament.

A slight change was made in the coronation oath at the coronation of Edward VI. in the omission of the references to the monasteries in the petition of the bishops, and in the king's answer. Henry VIII., indeed, seems to have contemplated a complete change of the oath. By this document the oath is rendered valueless by the saving clauses which are introduced, for no check could have been put upon the king by the oath.¹ However, it was never taken, for Edward VI.'s oath, with the exception just mentioned, is the same as that of his predecessors.

This ends the first portion of the service, in which the preliminary conditions necessary for the anointing are settled. The second portion, which contains the consecration and unction, now follow.

The king now lay prostrate before the altar, while there were said *Veni creator, Te invocamus*, a litany and the seven penitential psalms, followed by the four prayers, *Omnipotens Deus creator, Benedic Domine hunc præsulem, Deus ineffabilis, Deus qui populis*, and the consecratory preface, *Electorum fortitudo*. It will be seen that the second and third recensions have been combined in the fourth order. The king then arose, and was anointed not in three places only, as in the third recension, but in five: on his hands, after which the collect *Prospice omnipotens Deus* was said; then on his breast, shoulders and back, elbows, and head; and the important addition was made in this recension of adding unction with the holy chrism, the oil wherewith bishops and, anciently in England, presbyters were anointed.

¹ *English Coronation Records*, Doc. xxi.

190
Th
ass
sur
Un
the
Wh
the
it c
Car
leg
at S
with
sam
Hen
in h
duri
to
shou
obli
foun
had
Rich
rebe
Hen
for h
at hi
Refo
ever,
some
1
Wikes
1687,
oleo
mean
Edwar
the an
kings
lib. ii.
Pun a d
pars de
apres s
It is po
of Fran
E
W
Oxford
C
Brown,

The similarity of the royal to the episcopal ordination is thus asserted with great force in this recension. The anthem sung is the old anthem of the first and second recensions, *Unxerunt Salomonem*.

The unction with chrism began probably at the end of the thirteenth or the beginning of the fourteenth century. Who introduced it is not known at present. It is ordered in the early rubrics of the fourth recension,¹ and in consequence it cannot have been the discovery of the oil of St. Thomas of Canterbury which led to the introduction of the chrism. The legend of the oil of St. Thomas is that when St. Thomas was at Sens during his exile, the Blessed Virgin appeared to him with a phial of oil and an eagle in which to place it. At the same time she prophesied that the fifth king from the time of Henry II. would recover the Holy Land, if he kept this oil in his possession. The oil was to be hidden at Poitiers; and during the reign of Edward II., a Dominican brought the oil to the King, who consulted with the Pope whether he should receive it. The Pope hesitated, and the oil fell into oblivion.² During the reign of Richard II., however, it was found at the Tower by the king, and the story arose that it had been discovered at Poitiers by the Black Prince. Richard II. wished to be anointed with it, but the untimely rebellion of the Duke of Lancaster defeated this project. Henry IV., however, had no scruples in reviving the story for his own ends, and was anointed with the oil of St. Thomas at his coronation.³ This oil continued to be used till the Reformation, and perhaps later. Queen Mary Tudor, however, feared that it might have lost its efficacy, and sent for some fresh oil from her uncle, the Emperor Charles V.⁴

¹ It is possible that Edward I. was anointed with chrism. Thomas Wikes, in Gale and Fulman's *Historiae Anglicanae Scriptores*, Oxford, 1687, ii. 101, says in the year 1274 that the king 'sacrosancti Crismatis oleo delibutus, Regni diadema suscepit.' But *crisma* may here only mean unction. At the same time it is worth while to remember that Edward I. had been in the Holy Land, and he may there have heard of the ancient use of the Church of Jerusalem, which anointed the Latin kings of Jerusalem with chrism. (Martene, *De antiquis Ecclesiae Ritibus*, lib. ii. cap. x. ordo x. 'Après la pistelle, II. des prelas doivent venir au roi, l'un a dextre et l'autre a senestre, et le doivent mener treusques au faudesteuill pars devant l'autier, et la li doit dire le prelat aucunes beneissons, et puis apres si doit prendre le cresseme, et le doit oindre par desus le tour [*sic*]'). It is possible that Edward I., remembering also the custom of the kings of France, introduced the unction with the chrism.

² *English Coronation Records*, Doc. x.

³ William Stubbs, *Constitutional History of England*, cap. xviii., Oxford, 1878, iii. 11.

⁴ *Calendar of State Papers . . . of Venice, 1534-1554*, ed. Rawdon Brown, London, 1873, v. 432.

Whether this new oil was used at Queen Elizabeth's coronation is doubtful; that an oil of somewhat ancient confection was used is almost certain; for when she was about to be anointed, she made the characteristic remark that 'it was grease, and smelt ill.'¹

After unction, which the king received in all probability on his knees, the places of anointing were dried and covered up, and the archbishop said the prayers *Deus Dei Filius* and *Deus qui es justorum*, which close the portion of the service in which the consecration takes place.

The remaining division of the service is occupied with the investiture of the king with the external symbols of royalty and with his enthronement. The king receives the *colobium sindonis*, or albe, after which the royal ornaments are blessed with the prayer *Deus Rex regum*, and he receives the tunicle, buskins, spurs, sword, armil, and *pallium regale*. He next receives the crown. This was known as the crown of St. Edward, and was that with which the kings were usually crowned; but at Edward VI.'s coronation a change was introduced. This prince was crowned with three crowns, in this order: first St. Edward's crown, then the Imperial crown of the realm, and lastly 'a crown purposely made for his Grace.' Similarly, Queen Mary was crowned with three crowns, and Queen Elizabeth with two. The third crown in Edward VI.'s case was probably made because St. Edward's crown was too large for him to wear, though we do not hear of any similar incident at Henry VI.'s coronation. Nor does this explain why the Imperial crown was also put on. It is scarcely possible that in placing the three crowns on the king's head the Edwardian bishops, remembering the Pope's triple tiara, intended thus to symbolise the king's title of 'Supreme Head on Earth of the Church of England.' But it is at any rate a curious coincidence that during the use of that title by the sovereign of England, the three crowns were placed on the monarch's head, and that after its abandonment, two only seem to have been used for Queen Elizabeth's coronation.

After the crown, the king received the ring, and then ungirded his sword and offered it upon the altar, and the greatest earl present redeemed it for a hundred shillings, and carried it naked before the king during the rest of the solemnity. Then the sceptre and rod are delivered. The blessing *Benedicat tibi Dominus* is then pronounced; the

¹ *The Court of King James the First*, by Dr. Godfrey Goodman, ed. J. S. Brewer, London, 1839, p. 420.

king kisses the bishops, and *Te Deum* is sung, after which the king is enthroned by the archbishop, who addresses to the king *Sta et retine*. No acclamation is ordered either at this point or at the crowning, nor is there any trace, until the coronation of Queen Anne Boleyn, that at the imposition of the crown the dukes and earls put on their coronets.

The delivery of the ring is accompanied by much more solemnity than in the former orders, for the archbishop not only pronounces two blessings over it before giving it to the king, but the delivery is also followed by a collect in addition to the ordinary formula of delivery. One of the blessings is an expanded form of the prayer said by the king when he consecrated cramp-rings. The additions made to it are not in any way to be called improvements, but rather may justly be called superstitious.

After the enthronement of the king, the lords spiritual do their fealty, and the lords temporal their homage, and the latter ease the king by supporting the crown.

The fealty of the spiritual and the homage of the lay peers has not always taken place at this moment. As a dramatic arrangement this is undoubtedly the fittest place. Richard I., however, and also John, received the fealty and homage on the third day following their coronation. Now that the swollen peerage of our day makes the great length of the coronation service a serious problem, it might be useful to keep in mind the precedent of Richard I. and John.

The queen's coronation then follows. The prayer *Omnipotens sempiterne Deus fons* has been already said when she arrived at the door of the church. The order is the same as that of the third recension, with the exception that the prayer *Spiritus sancti gratia* has fallen out. The queen was anointed and crowned kneeling at the steps of the altar. She was anointed on the head and breast. When she was crowned alone she received the chrism as well as the oil of the catechumens, but when crowned with the king she was anointed only with simple oil, and a coif was placed on her head to protect the place anointed.

The queen consort receives no special robes as does the king. The directions are that she shall wear a mantle of crimson velvet with a train furred with ermins, and on her head a circlet of gold to restrain her hair, which is to 'lie fair about her shoulders.' This circlet is taken off before unction. The ornaments which the queen receives are the ring, the crown, the sceptre, and the ivory rod. After having

received these *regalia* she goes to her throne and bows herself to the king's majesty as she passes.

Mass then followed, with special anthems, collects, epistle, gospel, and preface. Special collects are even provided should the king and queen be crowned together. At the offertory the king and queen left their thrones and came crowned to the steps of the altar. There they offered bread and wine in the paten and chalice of St. Edward, and a mark of gold. With the bread they were afterwards to be communicated. Only one host appears to have been offered, for Richard III. and his queen were both 'houselled with one host divided between them.' The archbishop, after the offering, said the prayers, *Omnipotens Deus det tibi* and *Benedic Domine fortitudinem*, the old Biblical blessings which we noticed in the early recensions.

As was fitting on so solemn an occasion the king and queen both received communion that day. They received it together as a symbol of their conjugal union, and in one kind only; there is no trace that the King of England ever received in both kinds, as did the King of France. After communion they stood up, and wine was administered to them in St. Edward's chalice by the Abbot of Westminster as a purification.

When the service was over the king and queen retired to St. Edward's Chapel, where the king in a traverse was divested of his episcopal robes and of his crown and sceptres. All these were laid on the altar in the chapel. The king then put on a purple velvet robe, which was probably a more magnificent vestment than the parliament robe in which he came to the church, and the archbishop put on his head a 'crown of estate,' lighter but richer than the crown of St. Edward, and put the sceptre and rod into his hands again.

The queen likewise exchanged her crown for another, and, when all was ready, the king and queen returned in the same manner as they came to Westminster Hall for the banquet.

Thus ends this long service. The fatigue undergone by the king and queen, who were bound to go through the service fasting, must have been most severe. Indeed Richard II. was so exhausted by the ceremony that he was unable to walk, and had to be carried on the knights' shoulders back to the palace¹; and even at a time when fasting communion was not insisted upon with the strictness practised in the middle ages,

¹ Walsingham, *Historia Anglicana*, ed. H. T. Riley, Rolls Series, 1863, p. 337

we learn from a gossiping pamphlet that George IV. 'seemed very feeble' at the end of his coronation.

The fourth recension covers the period in which the services and forms due at the king's coronation received their final settlement and dignity. All has been carefully directed by the rubrics of the *Liber regalis*, and the directions of such documents as the *Little Device*. It is also the period in which Westminster Abbey definitely became the crowning place. Henry III., it will be remembered, was crowned at Gloucester in the first instance, though he was afterwards crowned again at Westminster. But the monks of Westminster, who drew up the long rubrics of *Liber regalis*, took care not to let slip the opportunity of fixing Westminster as the place where the king must be crowned. Moreover, it is the period in which symbolic meanings became more than ever attached to the *regalia*. The crown, ring, sceptre, and rod have, ever since the second recension, respectively symbolized the sovereign's glory, faith, royal power, and equity. Now the symbolism attaches itself to the three swords which are carried before the king. Though the name of the middle sword appears as *Curtana* as early as 1236, no meaning is attached to it till the time of Henry IV., and even then its meaning has not become fixed. At first it was doubtless carried before the king, because there were connected with it some historical associations which had led to its receiving a name, and because it was treasured, perhaps, as the relic of some former king, just as in France the sword *Joyeuse* of Charles the Great was carried before the king at his coronation. But at Henry IV.'s coronation we are told that the Prince of Wales carried the sword of justice, and we know from other sources that *Curtana* was carried by the Prince of Wales at that coronation. But at Henry VI.'s coronation, after St. Edward's staff came 'one with the sword of mercy,' that is, *Curtana*, 'a duke with the sword of justice for the laity,' and 'a duke with the sword of justice for the kirkmen.' These symbolic meanings the swords have retained ever since.

Another ornament appears among the *regalia* in the fifteenth century. This is St. Edward's staff, which is carried in the procession before the three swords. It is a long sceptre with a steel spike at the bottom, and its origin is doubtless derived from the staff which the king used while walking in the procession. In the fifteenth century it came to be looked on merely as a relic, and there is no evidence that it has since been ever put to the use that its origin would suggest as proper; but it has suffered the same fate as the crosier

of the modern Anglican bishop, which is carried as if it were the mace of a mayor, or as if it were, in some manner hard to define, the symbol of jurisdiction, instead of being borne in the hands of the person to whom it belongs.

We have now followed the history of the coronation service from the earliest mention of it in these islands to the period when it reached its zenith. It will be seen that the Reformation did not affect it directly; Edward VI., Mary, and Elizabeth were all anointed and crowned according to the Latin rite. This rite will continue to be used till late in the seventeenth century, though the language will no longer be Latin but English. The translation of the rite, a necessary step, is the forerunner of all the many changes which the service was to undergo in the next three centuries, until at the present day it has reached almost the lowest level it can reach without being altogether discontinued.

ART. II.—THE LAY FRANCHISE.

1. *House of Laymen for the Province of Canterbury.* Report of the Self-Government Enquiry Committee. May, 1901.
2. *Self-Government in the Non-Established Churches of the Anglican Communion. A Sketch of its Principles and Methods.* (Prepared for a Committee of the Synod of the Diocese of Salisbury.) By the Rev. H. C. POWELL, M.A., Prebendary of Salisbury Cathedral, and the Rev. C. L. DUNDAS, M.A., Prebendary of Salisbury Cathedral. Church Reform League Publications, No. 21.
3. *Two Views of the Lay Franchise.* By Mr. W. D. HOLLIS and the Rev. C. L. DUNDAS. Church Reform League Publications, No. 30.

THE resolution of the Canterbury House of Laymen, to which the Report which has been placed at the head of this article owes its origin, shows the very practical stage which the movement for Church Reform has now reached. The House resolved that a committee be appointed, in the first place, 'to inquire as to the methods and working of self-government in the Church of Ireland, the Episcopal and Established Churches of Scotland, and the Colonial and Foreign Churches in communion with the Church of England or otherwise.' That means that the demand of the reform movement is for a system of self-government in the Church ;

and an obvious preliminary is to study the constitutions and the experience of the self-governing churches of our own communion. Further, the committee was to inquire 'specially with reference to the position of laymen in those Churches in respect to their franchise, and to matters of doctrine and of ritual in which doctrine is involved.' That is, we have come to the question which must be settled, but which is the great difficulty—'the lion in the path' of church reform—viz. the question as to what constitutes membership in the Church.

This difficulty at the bottom of the ladder, like that at the top (viz. the relation of the Church to Parliament), arises, as we shall see, from the mutual connection of Church and State in England; but, as a preliminary, we may point out that the popular question 'Who is a member, or a layman, of the Church?' is hardly an accurate form of the problem. That question, taken strictly, is a theological one, and involves inquiry into the spiritual meaning of membership in the Church and the spiritual relation of individuals to the Lord, whereas in discussions as to the constitution of the Church the question is used in reference to external status and privilege. Even in this sense we shall find that the question 'Who is a member of the Church?' is insufficient. The analogy of the State shows that admission to a society does not necessarily carry with it participation in the full privileges of membership. Not everyone born in England has the franchise of an Englishman, viz. the right to exercise a share in the government of the country by voting for the election of a representative. Certain monetary and other qualifications are required; and so it may happen that an Englishman of an average education and intelligence, with an average stake in the welfare of the country, is, through certain technicalities of the law, debarred from the exercise of a vote. This happens, for instance, not unfrequently in the case of clergymen. Our question, then, rightly stated, should be 'What is the franchise of the Church?' But again the analogy of the State shows that there may be different franchises. Thus different qualifications are required in the cases of voting for members of parliament, of a county council, an urban council, a parish council, a school board, and so forth. Hence it is quite conceivable that in the Church there might be similar differences. In a scheme of representative councils it is natural that more should be required of those who sit in, or vote for, the higher legislative assemblies than of those who can exercise a voice (whether directly or through the election of a representative council)

in the self-government of the primary local unit of church life, viz. the parish. The latter franchise must form the basis in any system of self-government, and we may call it the lay franchise of the Church. The discussion of this franchise must lead the way, and accordingly to its consideration the present article shall be strictly limited.

This limitation will have the advantage of enabling us to avoid for the present the question of the share of the laity in the legislation of the Church, their position at councils, and so forth. This problem has been the subject of much contention, but the right of the local laity to have a voice in the affairs of the local church has never seriously been called in question. In striving to restore parochial self-government (in due subjection, of course, to the constitution and to the higher authorities of the Church), we are striving not only to carry out what is the theory and law of the Church, but also to revive ancient custom and practice. The difficulty to-day lies rather in the question, Who are the local laity or 'the parishioners' from the Church's point of view?

It is extremely important for us, at our advanced stage in the development of 'the parish,' to remember that originally the ecclesiastical parish was distinct from the civil division of the vill or township, which corresponds to the modern 'civil parish.' A recent *History of English Law*,¹ while discussing these divisions, states definitely that 'the parish of course is to start with a purely ecclesiastical district, and during the Middle Ages it is no unit in the geography of our temporal law, though from time to time the secular courts must notice it when disputes arise about tithes and the like.' Consequently the parishioners had a distinct ecclesiastical existence, apart from their position as members of a tything, vill or township. This distinction has been brought out by the investigation of mediæval churchwardens' accounts, in which Bishop Hobhouse has led the way. In publishing the accounts of six Somersetshire parishes,² the Bishop has stated his conclusions in a very interesting preface, and we had better give them in his own words:

'I found,' he writes (p. ix), 'that the "parish" was a purely religious organization, distinct in its origin, its *raison d'être*, its principles,

¹ Pollock and Maitland, 1895, vol. i. p. 548.

² *Churchwardens' Accounts of Croscombe and five other Parishes from 1349 to 1560*. By the Right Rev. Bishop Hobhouse. (Somerset Record Society, 1890.) The results of this study have been made more accessible to the public by Dr. Jessopp in an essay on mediæval 'Parish Life' in his *Before the Great Pillage* (London: Fisher Unwin, 1901).

its
comp
"par
Chur
With
his c
duty
pasto
with
every
gover
shoul
were
repre
were
for c
the o
The
appli

T
paris
repa
need
no s
and
foun
Arch
visita
and
case
were
viz.

1
be no
were
church
and th

2
ornam
viz. a
Manu
dalm
rochet
bell fo
banne
vessel
—the
with in

its working, and its aims, from the manor or the tything, though composed of the same personnel man for man.' Again (p. xi): 'The "parish" was the community dwelling in an area defined by the Church, organized for church purposes, subject to church authority. Within this area every resident was a parishioner, and, as such, owed his duty of worship and contribution to one stated church, and his duty of confession and submission to the official guidance of a stated pastor, entitled his rector. The community was completely organized with a constitution which recognized the rights of the whole and of every adult member to a voice in self-government, but kept the self-governing community under a system of inspection, and (if need should be) of restraint from central authority. The necessary officers were (1) the rector or his deputy; (2) the wardens, the chosen representatives of the parishioners.¹ . . . The whole adult population were accounted parishioners, and had an even voice when assembled for consultation under the rector. Seeing that both sexes served the office of warden, there can be no doubt that both had a vote. . . . The place of meeting was the church; . . . the name of "vestry" as applied to the church council nowhere appears.'

The main duty of 'the parish,' and the *raison d'être* of the parish meeting, was to keep the fabric of the church in due repair, and to provide all the ornaments and accessories needed for divine worship, which meant in the Middle Ages no slight demand.² The demand was made by the Church, and it was in this connection that the parishioners as such found recognition in Church law. Thus a constitution of Archbishop Reynolds in 1322 enjoins the archdeacons in their visitations to see that there is a due supply of ornaments &c., and also to give consideration to the fabric of the church, in case it should need repair, and if they found any defect they were to appoint a fixed time for its remedy, 'under penalty,' viz. of excommunication. The duty was an ecclesiastical

¹ By custom it has been established that one churchwarden should be nominated by the parson, the other by the people; but originally they were both the representatives of the parish. So Canon 89 enacts that churchwardens are to be 'chosen by the joint consent of the minister and the parishioners.'

² Archbishop Winchelsey's constitution of 1305 gives a list of the ornaments, &c. for which the parishioners are responsible: The books, viz. a Legend, Antiphoner, Gradual, Psalter, Troper, Ordinal, Missal, Manual. The vestments, viz. a principal vestment, with chasuble, a dalmatic, cope, &c., frontal for the high altar, three surplices, and a rochet. Ornaments—processional cross, funeral cross, censer, lamp and bell for the communion of the sick, pyx; an 'honest veil,' a Lent veil, banners for Rogation processions; bells with ropes, a bier, holy water vessel, pax-board, paschal candlestick, font with cover, images. Duties—the fencing of the churchyard, repair of the nave, within and without, with images and windows, repair of books and vestments.

one, and was to be enforced by ecclesiastical censure.¹ To fulfil this obligation the parish required a substantial income, which was derived in various ways, chiefly voluntary, *e.g.* by legacies, gifts, the offerings of guilds, church ales, &c. The administration of the funds and property which accrued to the parish lay with the wardens; and the chief business of the annual parish meeting, besides the election of wardens, was the audit of the outgoing wardens' accounts, the transfer of the parish funds to the new officers, and then to consult on the methods of meeting the expenses for the ensuing year. These methods included the church ales, miracle plays, parish and guild festivals, &c., which made up so much of the active parochial life of the Middle Ages, and were under the parish's own control; the outward manifestation of that vigorous church life thus rested upon a democratic basis.

This parochial constitution, we must carefully remember, was purely ecclesiastical. The mischief began when the State made use of this very convenient organization for secular purposes; and when it laid upon the churchwardens secular duties, and empowered them by statute to levy rates for the same, and made the duty of paying these rates obligatory upon all holders of property, it did in fact 'establish' the ratepayer. *Hinc illae lacrimae.* The action of the State was indeed excusable, because it began with a matter which had hitherto been supposed to lie in the special province of the Church, viz. the support of the poor. For we must date the 'establishment of the ratepayer' in 1601, when, after many preliminary steps in this direction, Parliament finally made the payment of a poor rate obligatory, and appointed the churchwardens with other overseers as the authorities for its levying and administration. This precedent was followed in the purely ecclesiastical matter of the maintenance of the Church and her services, when the church rate was made compulsory in 1813. In the Middle Ages the support of the Church had apparently been met for the most part by the various sources

¹ Pollock and Maitland (*op. cit.* i. p. 602) 'think it quite plain that in the thirteenth century the general custom of the Church of England . . . cast the burden of repairing the nave of the parish church and providing the main part of the ecclesiastical apparatus, not upon the parson, but upon the parishioners, and that the lay power left the spiritual tribunal free to enforce this custom by spiritual censures.' They go on to say, however, that they are by no means satisfied that this custom demanded any permanent organization of the parishioners, any 'vestry' that would meet and grant a rate,—*i.e.* as early as the thirteenth century. The organization, as described above, was certainly established in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Canon 85 devolves the duty upon the churchwardens.

of in
Wh
pari
offer
ings
by th
fulfil
could
statu
peace
thus
pulsio
T
anom
Chur
in its
were
comm
sent
chan
may
conf
clud
chan
State
whic
of c
paris
but
force
chur
paris
rates
cons
the
paris
may
not
'par
whic
the
was,
the
anon

of income mentioned above, which were purely voluntary. When these did not suffice, a contribution was laid upon the parishioners, but even this was regarded as a voluntary offering: it was compulsory in so far as to make such offerings was a duty of religion, and therefore could be enjoined by the Ordinary or church authority. Accordingly failure to fulfil the duty was a religious or ecclesiastical offence, and could be punished in the ecclesiastical courts. But the statute 53 George III., c. 127, empowered justices of the peace to order payment where the sum was under 10*l.*, and thus gave to church rates civil sanction and statutory compulsion.

This action of the State has given rise to the same anomaly and consequent confusion, at the basis of the Church's constitution, as that which prevails at the top, viz. in its relation to Parliament. When the Acts of Uniformity were passed, the Houses of Parliament were composed of communicant churchmen, and they could claim to represent the laity of the Church. By natural and legitimate changes the House of Commons has become a body which may include Roman Catholics, Scottish Presbyterians, Nonconformists, Jews, Agnostics—indeed no religion is excluded; nevertheless, because there has been no corresponding change in the constitutional relations between Church and State, this body retains the same power over Church affairs which it exercised when it was a body exclusively composed of churchmen. Similarly in the case of the parish, all parishioners once had an even voice in the parish meeting, but that was at a time when Church discipline was a living force, and all parishioners were churchmen and communicant churchmen (on which see below). By conferring upon these parishioners secular duties, and enforcing the payment of rates by all holders of property, Parliament has altered the constitution of the parish; it has practically disfranchised the poor who pay no rates, and has created a new 'civil parish' or 'vestry' of ratepayers. Thus a poor communicant may have no vote, while a Nonconformist or other who is not a churchman at all, if he pays rates, is legally a 'parishioner,' and can exercise the rights of a parishioner, which are still supposed to include the ancient rights of the parishioner in Church affairs which he possessed when he was, by obligation, a churchman.

Thus confusion between the old ecclesiastical parish and the modern civil parish has created an anomaly; but it is an anomaly which is felt to be no longer tolerable, and the aim of

the Church is now to establish a body of parishioners who are really churchmen, *i.e.*, to re-create the old Church parish. It is true that this is not the desire of all churchmen. The confusion has been of too long continuance. The condition of 'establishment' is popularly supposed to carry with it the corollary that a citizen of England is *ipso facto* a member of the Church of England, and therefore the ratepayers are the legally enfranchised laity of the Church. This position has been endorsed by no less an authority than the House of Laymen for the Province of York. On 8 May 1901 that House passed a resolution that 'the electors' [in the primary electoral divisions, or ecclesiastical parishes] 'shall be persons qualified to meet in vestry in and for these ecclesiastical parishes or districts;' and an amendment to limit the electors to such members of the vestry... 'as shall declare themselves to be lay members of the Church of England' was definitely rejected. But if all ratepayers are to have the franchise of the Church of England (whatever their creed), or in other words be reckoned as churchmen, then *cadit quaestio*. The (so-reputed) members of the Church have already an excellent representative system in the House of Commons, the county councils, urban and parish councils. What more do we want? Let them manage the affairs of the Church! Why complicate matters by another system of councils to be elected by the same people? But the majority of churchmen cannot accept this position: in fact they can with difficulty give it serious consideration; and so they are driven to inquire afresh for themselves—What should be the lay franchise? or who is 'the parishioner' in the sense of the Church?

As far as principle is concerned, the question is indeed superfluous. It is already settled by the law of the Church of England. This law is contained in the rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer, which in virtue of the Act of Uniformity of 1662, possess the force of statute law of the realm. In these rubrics we read that '*every parishioner* shall communicate at the least three times in the year, of which Easter to be one.' On the one hand this implies confirmation, for 'there shall none be admitted to the holy communion until such time as he be confirmed, or be ready and desirous to be confirmed;' and confirmation implies baptism.¹ On the other hand the Canons of the Church (of 1603) show how this

¹ Compare the rubric, 'The curate of every parish shall often admonish the people that they defer not the baptism of their children,' etc.

rubric
churc
and c
to th
the p
of six
befor
as ca
Reco
and
in the
at th
deane
31,50
In th
were
one c
popu
'fam
are n
have

(a
ducin
Comm
privil
fellow
admi
ciplin
powe
valen
Chur
Holy
origin
bratio
order

1 7
2 C
receiv
minist
church
presen

3 J
hither
Frere.
4 7
Mart
Canon

rubric is to be enforced. Canon 112 enacts that 'the minister, churchwardens, questmen, and assistants of every parish church and chapel shall yearly, within forty days after Easter, exhibit to the bishop or his chancellor the names and surnames of all the parishioners, as well men as women, which being of the age of sixteen years¹ received not the holy communion at Easter before.'² Such legislation was not meant to be a dead letter, as can be seen from extant records of visitations in the Public Record Office, which give the numbers of communicants and of those who abstain. Thus in a return for Lancashire in the reign of Elizabeth, otherwise undated, we are surprised at the large number of communicants; in Amownderness deanery there were 23,000, in Lailand 11,000, Warrington 31,500, Manchester 22,000, Blackburn 15,000—total, 102,500. In the diocese of Canterbury, in a visitation of 1569, there were not so many, the total number (with the exception of one deanery not returned) being 42,797 communicants. The population no doubt was smaller—12,820 is the number of 'families' given; and all cases of abstinence from Communion are noted: '113 persons rarely come to prayer, 112 persons have not communicated this year.'³

(a) In this legislation the Church of England was introducing no novelty. In the Church the receiving of the Holy Communion had always been the mark and duty, not to say privilege, of a churchman: the test whether a man was in the fellowship of the Church lay simply in this—will he be admitted to Holy Communion? The whole power of discipline which the Church possessed rested simply on her power of excluding from Holy Communion, which was equivalent to excluding from her fellowship. And as soon as the Church began to legislate for her members, the receiving of Holy Communion was made obligatory upon them. The original custom had been for all present to receive at the celebration; and this ideal the Church sought to perpetuate by ordering, in the Council of Antioch, A.D. 341 (Canon 2⁴),

¹ The Canon of 1571 said 'fourteen years.'

² Cf. also Canons 21 and 22: 'Whereas every lay person is bound to receive the holy communion thrice every year.' In Canon 26 the minister is not to 'admit to the receiving of the holy communion any churchwardens or sidesmen who fail to present;' but the grounds of the presentments here specified are 'public offences.'

³ *State Papers, Q. Elizabeth*, xxxi. f. 47, lx. f. 71. For these hitherto unpublished references the writer is indebted to Rev. W. H. Frere.

⁴ This was incorporated into the collection of canons made by Martin, bishop of Braga (c. 572 A.D.). The ninth of the Apostolic Canons is to the same effect.

that all who came to church, but abstained from participation in the Eucharist, should be excommunicated. But this high standard could not be maintained. The Council of Toledo of A.D. 398 mentions those who come to church and never communicate: such are to be put to penance. The Council of Agdé in A.D. 506 refuses the title or repute of 'Catholic' to those who fail to communicate at Christmas, Easter, and Pentecost; while the Council of Tours in 813 definitely enacted that the laity should communicate at least three times a year.¹ We take one step lower down when the Lateran Council of A.D. 1215 made communion once a year obligatory on all churchmen. This minimum once reached, it has remained the law of the Church ever since, and for the Roman Church was renewed at the Council of Trent.

In England the earliest definite rule upon the subject extant is a canon of a Council at Ensham, A.D. 1009, which prescribes communion at least three times a year, and the same regulation is repeated in Cnut's Laws (c. 19), so that it was the law of the State as well as of the Church. The canon of the Lateran Council of 1215 would of course have been binding in England, but there is besides a definite enactment in the English Canon Law, viz. a constitution of Archbishop Sudbury (A.D. 1378), which shows the English hankering after the 'three times a year.' This ordains that 'confessions are to be heard thrice a year, and the people are to be admonished to communicate thrice, viz. at Easter, Pentecost, and the Nativity of our Lord. . . . But whosoever shall not confess to his proper priest at least once a year, and at least receive the blessed sacrament at Easter (unless he abstain by advice of his confessor) is to be prohibited from entering the church while alive, and when dead is to forfeit Christian burial.'²

The First Prayer-book of King Edward (1549) adopted the minimum standard when it ordered parishioners 'to communicate once in the year at the least,' and those who absent themselves willingly upon no just cause are 'upon proffe thereof to be excommunicate.' It was the Second Prayer-book of 1552 which raised the standard to three times a year, as it remains in the present book. It is not to be supposed that this insistence on communion was peculiar to the Catholic Church. Indeed emphasis on communion was

¹ This canon has been incorporated into the *Corpus Juris Canonici*, Decr. iii. pars. de Consecrat. dist. ii. c. 16, where it is assigned to Fabian, bishop of Rome.

² Cf. the rubric in the Burial Service, 'the office ensuing is not to be used for any that die . . . excommunicate.'

one of the chief characteristics of the Reforming party, and its revival in practice their aim. Protestants and Puritans were equally rigid in their requirement of communion. The custom of never communicating may have prevailed even in the Middle Ages, but always with the sense that it was irregular; the acquiescence in it as a normal condition of Christian life, not incompatible with church membership, cannot be carried back further than the eighteenth century.

(b) Once more, this legislation of the whole Church is in entire conformity with the scriptures and the spiritual and theological account of the Church. Membership in the Church means membership of Christ. Into this membership we are admitted by holy baptism, our new birth; which is completed by the gift of the Spirit of Christ in confirmation—the endowment needed for the full exercise of this membership. But admission and membership are not identical terms. Life in the Church, being membership with Christ, must be a growing life—a growing into a more and more complete union with Him. Our present union, however, is constantly being weakened by sin; and we need continually not only restoration from sin, but also fresh supplies of grace to meet the demands of the growing life. This double want is satisfied in the Holy Communion, which is (as we learn from the words of institution, from St. John vi. and 1 Cor. x. 16) 'the communion of the body and blood of Christ.' The life of the churchman therefore is necessarily the life of a communicant; and in the text which gives us our New Testament definition of churchmanship (Acts ii. 42) we read that 'they continued stedfastly in the Apostles' teaching and fellowship, *in the breaking of bread* and the prayers.'

The principle then seems perfectly clear. The law of the Church of England requires all its members, or, to speak strictly, its 'parishioners,' *i.e.* members possessing the franchise, to be communicants. This law follows the precedent of all previous Church law and custom; and it is based upon Scripture and the command of the Lord (*Do this: Drink ye all of it*). Nevertheless, when to the question 'Who is a member of the Church?' we answer 'A communicant,' a great outcry is raised. The demand to limit the Church franchise to communicants is looked upon as being not merely narrow and illiberal, but in fact impossible.

No doubt there is still a great and wholesome reaction
VOL. LIII.—NO. CVI. U

against such legislation as the Corporation and the Test Acts,¹ and a real horror at the peril of profanation in making the Holy Communion serve as a test or a qualification. But the great body of objection to the so-called 'communicant test' is, we imagine, really due to the widespread indifference to and ignorance of Church principles, which has been the natural result of two causes. The first of these is the decay of Church life and discipline, of which the disastrous break with the traditions of the past in the time of the Commonwealth may be looked upon as the primary source, and which continued to make steady way throughout the eighteenth century. The other is the confusion between Church and State in the popular mind consequent upon 'establishment' or the special constitutional relations of those two bodies in England. Now, so far as objection is due to such causes, the only course for churchmen is simply to persist in the maintenance of Church principles, with all gentleness and meekness, but with all firmness. But, on the other hand, we have to consider facts. The Church has to deal with men and countries as they are; and at no time have the secular conditions of her environment been ideal; they certainly are not so in England at present. Again, the Church has never yet attained to her own ideal; in some ages she has fallen far short of it, and the difficulties of the present situation are, we must confess, in no small measure due to the failures, the neglect, and shortcomings of the Church of England in the past. Hence we are bound to give serious consideration to arguments which can be urged in favour of a relaxation of the existing law or theory of the Church. These can be summed up as follows:

(1) There is the initial anomaly that a great mass of church people, who attend the Church's services and call themselves 'churchmen,' are not communicants. This fact is the *fons et origo mali*; and to a student of theology or a devout Christian it is an amazing fact. But when we turn to the consideration of human nature and to the study of history, we find that very soon after the beginning of Christianity

¹ These Acts required every one holding any office under the king, whether in army, navy, or elsewhere, and every magistrate, officer, &c., in a corporation, to receive the Blessed Sacrament as a condition of holding office. To these Acts was largely due the growth of the custom of abstaining from communion. But we must remember that they were not the work of a 'persecuting' Church, but of a Restoration and Royalist Parliament, burning with zeal and hatred against the *régime* of the Commonwealth and all its supporters. The legislation of the Church required communion, but only of her own members.

the difficulty of keeping the average churchman up to the standard of the communicant life was discovered. The mass of Catholics soon acquiesced in making their communion once a year, and many were only kept up to that standard by the exercise of discipline. Our present condition, therefore, while largely due to the Church's neglect of teaching and discipline, would reflect an average condition of religious practice, when the pressure of force is removed; and the exercise of compulsion in this matter all would deprecate.

(2) Further, among these non-communicants are many who abstain from communion not because of any laxity of life, but from worthy motives—from scrupulousness, or fear, or a misunderstanding of the phrase in 1 Cor. xi. 29, '*eateth and drinketh damnation to himself.*' Many non-communicants live very exemplary lives, while, on the other hand, many who do communicate live, shall we say, at least 'no better than their neighbours;' and to draw a sharp line between the two classes would in many cases shock the moral conscience of the people at large.

(3) Owing to this initial fact the communicants are few in number and would form a comparatively limited franchise. It is true that the *Church Year Book* for 1901 returns their numbers as 1,974,629, which is by no means a small body. But among these would be included a number under age (21), and several Dissenters; the great majority would probably be women, and the numbers would be very unevenly distributed. There are many parishes still in which the communicants are very few—in some parishes perhaps confined to the occupants of the parsonage or hall, with one or two officials or devout women; and to restrict the franchise to communicants would be in effect to establish an oligarchy, which would defeat the aims of those who are anxious to restore self-government to the Church.

(4) When we inquire of the experience of the self-governing Churches in communion with us, we find that they have nearly all abandoned the communicant franchise. In the Church of South Africa the 'parishioner' is defined as being a communicant, but an alternative is given: 'by parishioner shall be understood any person, not being under Church censure, who is on the list of communicants or . . . who, being baptized, and not being a member of any other religious body, is an habitual worshipper, etc.' Jamaica and Scotland have similar definitions. In the Episcopal Church of Scotland and in South Africa, only communicants can vote for lay representatives in the 'elective assembly' for the election of

bishops. But among all the Churches of the Anglican communion the fundamental franchise is limited to communicants in these dioceses only: viz. four dioceses in the province of Rupertsland (Rupertsland, Qu'Appelle, Saskatchewan, Calgary); three in the province of South Africa (St. John's Kaffraria, Bloemfontein, Natal); two in the United States of America (Arkansas, Oklahoma).¹

To this we may add the example of the Established Church of Scotland. As all the administration of a parish lay in the hands of the minister and Kirk Session, there had been no occasion to raise the question of a lay franchise in Scotland. But in 1874, when the patronage of the churches was placed in the hands of the congregation, the congregation was defined in the regulating Act of Parliament as consisting of '(a) communicants, and (b) *such other adherents*' as the Kirk Session might determine to be members of the congregation.²

(5) To make the case as strong as possible we must add the argument from expediency. It is asserted, with great confidence, that Parliament, which must give its assent to any measure for self-government for the Church, would absolutely refuse to give any self-governing powers to the Church, if the franchise was limited to so small a proportion of the nation as the body of church communicants.

(6) Lastly, there are those who, while confessing that the communicant franchise is the ideal, plead that the surest means of finally obtaining it is by the way of present concession. The exercise of Church privileges in itself tends to raise the tone of Church life. In South Africa and Jamaica non-communicants seldom claim their right of voting; and at home experience has shown that where the laity take their share in Church administration they have come to be the most vehement asserters of Church principles. So it is confidently expected that the practice of self-government, with a wider franchise, will of itself ultimately lead to the full recovery of the principle of communicant membership.³

In the face of these arguments we must still reply that if principle is concerned in this matter, the Church of Christ cannot recede. If our Lord has laid it down that members of the Church are members of His own body, and that union

¹ See Powell and Dundas, *Self-government, &c.* pp. 12-13, and the tables in the *Report of the Self-government Inquiry Committee*, pp. 34-40.

² See Lord Balfour of Burleigh in *Church Reform Essays*, p. 89.

³ The cases for concession and for the rigid maintenance of principle cannot be put more vigorously than they are by Preb. Dundas and Mr. Hollis respectively in *C.R.L. Publications*, No. 30.

with Him is to be maintained by the rite of sacramental communion, the Church cannot prescribe any other conditions of membership. For secular purposes, the payment of poor rates or the repair of highways, it is not necessary that parishioners should be communicants or even churchmen; but for the administration of the affairs of the Church, which can never be purely secular, we cannot be satisfied with less than a communicant franchise for 'the parishioner.'

The arguments given above are weighty, but an answer could be given to each one. Space forbids the discussion of them in detail, but an argument from expediency, which will balance No. (6), is too important to be omitted. It is this: that if once the standard of churchmanship is relaxed in legislation as well as in practice, we shall never be able to restore it to its old level. The mass of people derive their ideas of right and wrong not from principle or theory, but from the actual requirements and utterances of the law. The law forms their standard, and what is legal or illegal tends to become the right or wrong. Hence, let it once be conceded in Church legislation that a non-communicant may enjoy the Church franchise, and it will become practically impossible to win back the position that only a communicant can be a true member of the Church. The rite of confirmation will afford an illustration. Those who are acquainted with Church history are aware that the laying on of hands was an indispensable adjunct to—we might almost say an integral part of—holy baptism. This view of the rite has been preserved by the Church of England, who in her Prayer-book deliberately requires the baptized to be confirmed in due course, and makes confirmation a condition of communion. Nevertheless these regulations have been much neglected in the Church. In various parts of England, for various causes, many of the unconfirmed have been, and are still, admitted to communion; and after such admission the requirement of confirmation would be regarded by many as a hardship. In spite of this we can point to the law of the Church; whatever relaxation may be made in individual cases, however widespread may be the declension from the Prayer-book standard, we can still say that it is an anomaly and contrary to the law, and we can work for a better observance of the law. But take away those rubrics and we take away our legal standpoint; the present neglect becomes lawful and its remedy will prove impossible; the zeal of the clergy may cause an increase in the number of confirmations, but at the best the rite will remain a voluntary practice, estimable, but not essential,

something for the elect, not a grace needed for the normal Christian life. The history of confirmation is a great warning of the peril of ever laying it down in Church law that a non-communicant may claim the membership of the Church.

Can then nothing be done to meet the practical difficulty, which, when all has been said, remains enormous? Is there no way of meeting it without the sacrifice of principle? We think that there is; and it is to be found in the definition of a 'communicant.' Hitherto that definition has turned upon the number of acts of communion. But this is really to apply number to matters of a different category. Spiritual relations cannot be measured by weight or counted by arithmetic. For, we may ask, how many acts of communion are necessary to establish membership of the Church? The Church of England says 'three times a year;' but, from the religious and spiritual standpoint, are three communions in the year sufficient for that growing life of union with our Lord which is the life of the true churchman? And if three times are not sufficient, how much less once a year—a measure which would be accepted by all as sufficient for the Church franchise? Here, then, is an obvious confusion between the internal and external aspects of membership, and for a test of membership in its external aspect we must seek another basis or ground of reckoning. This is, very obviously, to be found in *status*, a man's position or condition. We have to ask, not what the man does, but what he can do? what is his present standing in the eye of the law?

When a man has been baptized and confirmed, and has received his first communion, he has become a full member of the Church. To maintain that membership in its true meaning, *i.e.* to continue advancing in the Christian life, he should become a regular communicant. But if he fails to do this, it is his personal spiritual loss; just as the frequency of his communions, whether once a year or once a month or once a week, remains a matter of his private spiritual life, so abstinence from communion does not in itself affect his external status in the Church. To forfeit the status into which he entered at his first communion—in other words, to be made excommunicate—should require some definite action on the part of the Church. Excommunication *ipso facto* is very unsatisfactory, and the old canon law required that sentence of excommunication should become valid only after due monition and notice. So it should be now. It may be desirable to excommunicate the non-communicant, or it may

not
un-
pri-
is
mu-
Th-
Th-
the
on
at t
hes-
an
com-
can

has
mal
gen-
in t
and
regi-
pers-
mun-
the
Bes-
with
all
diffi-
pres-
in J
had

Prac-
desc-
obje-
adv-
it in
1901
conf-
good
Scrip-
1
of a
Lay-
those
Chur-

not ; but until a man has received definite notice that he is under Church censure he ought to be able to claim the privileges of his status. The status of a non-communicant is not the same as that of an excommunicate. 'Non-communicant' and 'excommunicate' are not identical terms. This is abundantly proved by the practice of the clergy. There are many of his non-communicant parishioners whom the parson exhorts and urges to come to communion ; and if on some Sunday or festival one such should present himself at the altar rails, the priest would communicate him without hesitation or rather with joy. Such a person is evidently not an excommunicate ; and if he is qualified to receive holy communion, the greatest privilege of the Church, surely he can exercise a vote as a parishioner ?

This method of reckoning the franchise, viz. by status, has this further advantage that it avoids both the danger of making Holy Communion a test and the procedure which generally made Church discipline so obnoxious to the laity in times past, viz. the method of personal inquiry. Baptism and confirmation are single public acts which can easily be registered, and appeal can be made to the record without personal inquisition ; but to count up the number of communions bears the appearance of making an inquiry into the individual's spiritual life and personal relation to God. Besides, the increased facilities for travelling in modern times, with the consequent incessant changing of residence among all classes, would make the reckoning of communions a difficult matter. It was this practical difficulty—so the present writer has been informed—which caused the Church in Jamaica to abandon the communicant franchise, which had been its original constitution.

This method, however, is open to one great objection. Practically it is equivalent to what would be popularly described as a confirmation test, which is open to all the objections against the communicant test without sharing its advantages. So at least Colonel R. Williams, M.P., expressed it in a debate in the Canterbury House of Laymen on July 2, 1901: 'While the communicant test was a good test, the confirmation test might be said to be neither fish, fowl, nor good red herring, having the sanction neither of law nor Holy Scripture.'¹ Here, again, the answer is that we have come

¹ *Guardian*, July 10, 1901. It is utterances like this from a member of a House of Laymen, and resolutions like that of the York House of Laymen quoted above, which form the greatest obstacles to the work of those who advocate giving to the laity a full share in the councils of the Church.

to a matter of law and principle. For, *pace* Colonel Williams, confirmation has the sanction both of law and Holy Scripture. Quotations from the rubrics already given show that it is most definitely the present law of the Church of England.¹ And of all the Church's sacramental rites that of confirmation has almost the best Scriptural authority. From the doctrine of the Acts and Epistles it is most evident that it is the gift of the Spirit which makes the Christian, and this gift is unmistakably associated with the laying on of hands, which is mentioned as following upon baptism. Acts viii. 14-18 is a crucial passage, for there it is dogmatically stated that 'as yet [the Holy Ghost] was fallen upon none of [the Samaritans]: only they had been baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus. Then laid they [the Apostles] their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost.' And Simon perceived that 'through the laying on of the Apostles' hands the Holy Ghost is given.'

Moreover there is a strong positive argument in favour of the 'confirmation test.' What is required is some definite sign or pledge of churchmanship, and nothing serves for that purpose so well as confirmation. The idea of the ratepaying qualification has not been discussed above, as being quite untenable in theory: that it is also quite impracticable in fact has been proved by the Diocesan Conferences of last autumn, for their resolutions have made it quite clear that churchmen will never accept such a franchise. The question of the lay franchise was brought forward in the majority of the Conferences, and gave rise to keen discussion, together with many amendments which had to be put to the vote. On the negative side the ratepaying franchise was definitely rejected by the Conferences of Oxford, St. Davids, Ripon (with 2 or 3

¹ In this the Church is again only following her ancient law. The rubric which forbids the admission to communion of persons who are not confirmed is derived from a constitution of Archbishop Peckham, A.D. 1281, while at the beginnings of the Church in England we read in Archbishop Theodore's Penitential, 'We believe that no one is made perfect in baptism without the confirmation of the bishop.' For the sake of Colonel Williams and others it may be as well to quote in full Canon 60. 'Forasmuch as it hath been a solemn, ancient, and laudable custom in the Church of God, continued from the Apostles' times, that all bishops should lay their hands upon children baptized and instructed in the Catechism of Christ's religion, praying over them and blessing them, which we commonly call *Confirmation*; and that this holy action hath been accustomed in the Church in former ages to be performed in the bishop's visitation every third year: we will and appoint that every bishop or his suffragan, in his accustomed visitation, do in his own person carefully observe the said custom.'

dissentients), York (1 dissentient), and Newcastle (1 dissentient). On the positive side the confirmation franchise was accepted by St. Albans (by 38 to 12) and Hereford. Amendments in its favour were carried at Exeter (by 47 to 39) and Liverpool, but were afterwards nullified by the passing of the previous question or substitution of a colourless resolution. Llandaff (by 59 to 40), Winchester ('almost unanimously'), and Rochester (by 109 to 22) carried the communicant franchise; at Southwell and Lincoln resolutions in favour of this franchise, which were strongly supported, were evaded by the previous question. The lowest qualification was that adopted at Manchester, viz. the ratepayer *plus* baptism and a declaration of Church membership; but amendments to the same effect were negatived at Peterborough, and at Truro (by 41 to 25), where no final decision was arrived at. It has not, however, been made sufficiently clear that a ratepaying qualification, however safeguarded and confined to members of the Church, is really a *disfranchising* measure; for it disfranchises all Church members who are poor, or other than householders. But in the Church all the communicants at least are equal; for in Christ 'there is neither Jew nor Greek, bond nor free, male nor female,' and, as we must add, 'rich nor poor.'

The voice of the Church then, as far as it can express itself in these Conferences, has clearly demanded some definite profession of churchmanship. For such, besides the act of communion, there are but three alternatives left: (1) *A Declaration of Membership* is obviously insufficient. Owing to the present confusion between Church and State in the popular mind, many persons who avowedly belong to other religious bodies claim to be members of the Church of England because it is 'the established Church.' This contention may be answered by an *argumentum ad hominem*. Some years ago many nonconformists refused to pay church rates, on the ground that they did not belong to the Church; it is surely inconsistent to plead now that because they pay secular rates they are members of the Church. If this inconsistency is not patent enough, it ought to be clear to all that a claim to membership carries with it a recognition of the duties of membership and of the obligation to loyalty. In fact, however, a distinction between citizens or parishioners who are members of the Church of England and those who are not has been clearly drawn both in recent legal decisions and in Acts of Parliament. Thus the New Parishes Act of 1843 provides that the churchwardens of the parishes constituted

in accordance with it shall be 'members of the United Church of England and Ireland.' The Universities Test Act of 1871 relieved persons taking degrees or receiving offices &c. in the Universities from the necessity of making any religious subscription or declaration of faith, as a condition of holding such offices &c., but it provided that the Act was not 'to open any office to any person who is not a member of the Church of England where such office is at the passing of this Act confined to members of the said Church.' The Public Worship Regulation Act of 1874 required the 'aggrieved parishioner' to sign a declaration of membership 'of the Church of England as by law established.' Similarly in the law courts: in the Ilminster School case of 1860 the House of Lords unanimously rejected the proposition, which had been advanced at the bar, 'that courts of justice cannot recognize any distinction between the members of the Church of England and Dissenters, and that all inhabitants of the parish are to be deemed members of the Church of England.' Since then the distinction has again been definitely recognized: *e.g.* in the Perry Almshouses case, 1895, both by Mr. Justice Stirling in his judgment and by the Lords Justices Lindley, Chitty, and Vaughan Williams on appeal.¹ Lastly, it has been pointed out in the *Guardian* of December 4, 1901, that the Act of 1868, which abolished compulsory rates, enacts that 'no person who makes default in paying the amount of a church rate for which he is rated shall be entitled to inquire into, or object to, or vote in respect of the expenditure of the moneys arising from such church rates.' This provision gives an emphatic endorsement to the principle that only churchmen should take part in the administration of church affairs.

(2) Many churchmen consider that *Holy Baptism* is a sufficient profession of churchmanship, inasmuch as it gives admission into the Church. Baptism is certainly a new birth; but whether it conveys the full endowment of membership apart from confirmation requires separate consideration. Into this question, however, we need not now enter; for our present custom of indiscriminate administration of holy baptism makes imperative the need of some further qualification on the part of the individual. Baptism alone might conceivably form a qualification for the franchise, but baptism administered to adults after solemn pledges on their part, or, in the case of infants, after solemn pledges made by sponsors who are held to their observance. But at the present time, in many

¹ See also Lord Selborne in his *Defence of the Church of England against Disestablishment*, p. 195.

parishes, holy baptism is administered indiscriminately to all who are brought; the presence of proper sponsors is not insisted upon, and sponsorship is treated as a mere form. If there happens to be no Church school in the parish, the child may—and often does—grow up in practical heathenism, or at least in ignorance of the faith of the Church. Thus administered, baptism is no more effective as a qualification for or evidence of Church membership than natural birth or simple citizenship of the country. What is required, from the Church point of view, is some personal act on the part of the individual himself when he has come to years of discretion, to serve as a sign of his acceptance of or claim to her membership. Such a sign is admirably supplied by (3) the rite of *Confirmation*, which is in fact the first demand made by the Church upon the individual after his baptism, and therefore is the first test of his loyalty to her.

It will be evident that we have passed over many matters in relation to the franchise which will have to be settled, *e.g.* the questions of age, sex, and residence; also questions about Church censure, outward loyalty to the Church, &c. Some of these questions are of great importance, especially that of sex, but, after all, they are matters of detail. In this article we have strictly limited ourselves to what is the most important question, *viz.* the question of principle, because this is fundamental. And we have come to the conclusion that we must maintain the principle that the member of the Church, or, speaking strictly, 'the parishioner' who enjoys the Church franchise, is a communicant. But in settling the franchise the appeal should be not to the number of communions made, but to the status of the individual; and his status is conferred by definite acts, *viz.* of baptism and confirmation. A man who has been baptized and confirmed, and has received the Holy Communion, unless he has been definitely placed under Church censure, or convicted himself of disloyalty by openly joining another religious body, ought to be able to claim the franchise. To acquiesce in a lower standard than this is impossible for a churchman.

ART. III.—THE MEDIÆVAL FRANKISH MONARCHY.

1. *Histoire de la France depuis les Origines jusqu'à la Révolution.* Par ERNEST LAVISSE. Publiée avec la collaboration de MM. BAYET, BLOCH, CARRÉ, COVILLE, KLEINCLAUSZ, LANGLOIS, LEMONNIER, LUCHAIRE, MARIÉJOL, PETIT-DUTAILLIS, REBELLIU, SAGNAC, VIDAL DE LA BLACHE. Tomes I, II, III. (Paris, 1900, 1901.)
2. *Histoire des Institutions Monarchiques de la France sous les Premiers Capétiens.* Par ACHILLE LUCHAIRE. (Paris, 1883.)
3. *Les Communes Françaises sous les Capétiens Directs.* Par ACHILLE LUCHAIRE. (Paris, 1890.)
4. *The Growth of the French Nation.* By GEORGE BURTON ADAMS. (London, 1896.)
5. *Philip Augustus.* By WILLIAM HOLDEN HUTTON. (London, 1896.)
6. *Saint Louis.* By FREDERIC PERRY. (London, 1901.)

THE publication of the earlier parts of the complete History of France which has been undertaken by M. Ernest Lavissee, with the assistance of some of the most able historical scholars of his country, suggests an investigation, on the lines of recent French work, into the causes of the growth of the monarchy which came to play so interesting a part in the history of mediæval Europe. Although the long story of a great mediæval institution can only be briefly summarized, yet the summary is worth making.

The Frankish monarchy is indeed a remarkable phenomenon in the history of mediæval Europe. It is the great institution which, looking back to a far distant past, with its roots in the dim days before Christ lived on earth, attracted to itself all that had life and strength in the peoples, of varying histories, traditions, origins, blood, that covered the lands between the Mediterranean, the Rhine, the Meuse, the Channel, and the Bay of Biscay. It made union out of lands and among tribes that only in it learnt their kinship. Starting from the half-geographical, half-moral, centre of indescribable power, the age-long city of Paris, acquiring, little by little, new developments on different sides, new strips of territory, new races and interests, and welding them together with a masterly precision of touch, shedding here and there

superfluous additions, without the slightest loss of vitality to the central point of power, the French monarchy emerged after many generations of warfare and of growth as the strongest in Europe, as the central fact, indeed, in European life and thought.

First a word as to origins. The French monarchy—more strictly speaking the kingship of the Franks—was one of the many survivals of the great Roman empire. In the second century before Christ the Greek colony of Massilia, which is now Marseilles, asked the help of Rome against some of the Gaulish tribes that attacked her. The help was given. It led, like all help of the kind, to conquest and colonization. About 120 B.C. the Romans mapped out and organized a province—*Provincia*, which later came to be called *Provence*—northwards to Geneva and to Lyons, west from about the southward end of the Cevennes towards Toulouse, and thence south to the Pyrenees. It is the land which one may now pass through if one goes by train from Marseilles to Bayonne, a beautiful and varied country, with forests and stretches of sea-coast, with vast plains and rugged mountains, bright and sunny, sprinkled over with ruins of early days, mediæval castles now destroyed, churches altered, often lone Roman remains. It was this province which Cæsar ruled in 58 B.C., and whence he beat back the Germans to the Rhine. It was from this province that he carried his arms northwards till he had put all Gaul under the power of Rome. Two rebellions were crushed, and then Gaul settled down, and the most perfect conquest that the world has ever known began. For four centuries Gaul was under Roman rule, and it was completely Romanized. Roman roads, Roman law, Roman art, Roman civilization everywhere won the day. The race remained Celtic, but it was thoroughly Latin in its life. That then is the first characteristic on which we have to build—a thorough Romanization, in law, culture, sympathy.

The second comes from the force and power of Christianity. Among early Christian martyrs few are more renowned than those who died in Southern Gaul. Paganism lived on, concealed, in many country districts, but the life and power and thought of the peoples became by the time of Constantine, by the fourth century, entirely Christian. As the state organized so did the Church. Gaul had seventeen provincial governments: it came to have seventeen archbishops, and under them bishops for each great city. On the Roman empire and the Christian Church the foundations were laid; and they were laid firm.

At the beginning of the fifth century a terrible storm swept over the land. It was the storm of Teutonic invasion. Vandals, Burgundians, Alans, Suevi poured over the country; the Huns followed them, only to be beaten back by a union of the other tribes. Then, after the battle of Châlons, A.D. 451, there gradually rose out of the Teutonic conquerors the conquering power of one tribe, that of the Franks.

By the first ten years of the sixth century Gaul was united again, under the rule of Chlodowech (Clovis), King of the Franks. Till well on in the Middle Ages it was that title which the rulers of Gaul always bore, 'Rex Francorum,' King of the Franks. France to-day still dates her existence as a nation from the baptism of Clovis. It was that, his admission into the Catholic Christianity of the Gauls over whom he ruled, which enlisted on the side of the Frankish rule all the culture and civilization which had never died out since the Roman days. Under the fostering care of the Church it had survived. Brotherhood, charity, compassion, unity, all the great ideas which the Church cherished, were to work in long ages the transformation of the Frankish kingship. And when Chlodowech became king under the blessing of the Church, which had survived all through these centuries since it was planted under the Romans, the fusion of races soon followed. The French nation as we now know it is not merely Celtic, or Gaulish, but Roman too, and lastly Frankish—that is, Teutonic.

From 481 to 751 one dynasty ruled the land—the dynasty of the Merwings, descendants of Chlodowech. We read in the pages of that great historian and great bishop Gregory of Tours the terrible tale of their crimes, their brutal luxury, their lust for blood, the unbridled licence of their passions. That was the record of the days of their decay. But for a century and a half they had among them strong rulers, great conquerors, men of iron as well as of blood. There was, however, at the best a great change from the times of Roman rule. For civilization, literary culture, law we find substituted in the pages of Gregory of Tours savagery, scenes of brutality, drunkenness, robbery. Law and civilization seem to sleep. It was in this state of the country, when every man's hand was against his neighbour, when law was unheard amid the strife, that feudalism arose, a natural development of the desire for self-preservation, which led to associations to supply the mutual protection which there was no strength behind the law to enforce. Here, then, we have a third element, a third factor in the process by which the mediæval

Fr
socie
land
step
negl

faith
thro
And
was
had
taug
arou
offic
their
powe
woul
often
swept
centr
Rom
the K
the t

T
not t
powe
in Ga
rity,
West
allian
It is
mona
Rom
fesse
adopi
repub

E
in Ga
rule
ocean
'ruler
influe
Bulge
and p

Frankish monarchy was evolved. Feudalism, the idea of society in which every man is linked to every man by a tie of land and by a tie of personal service or personal lordship, stepped in to remedy the defects of a weakened government, neglected laws, personal isolation.

Feudalism, Roman administration and law, Christian faith and discipline, these three factors were at work throughout the dark ages from the fifth to the ninth century. And first and most obviously, the monarchy of the Merwings was a patent imitation of the Roman empire. The clergy had maintained the imperial tradition. It was they who taught the sovereigns to replace the emperors and to produce around them the illusion of a Roman rule.¹ They employed officers with the same titles, centred their administration in their household, claimed and exercised unlimited power. No power above them did they recognize, save only, when they would listen to their teachers, the power of the love—more often the fear—of God. The barbarian invasions that had swept over the land had destroyed the local as well as the central administration. At Arles survived the relics of the old Roman functionaries of the prefecture; but in the land of the Franks the whole system had to be reconstructed from the tradition of which the Church was the faithful guardian.

Thus the real aim of Chlodowech and his successors was, not to conquer the Roman empire, not to substitute a Teutonic power for a Roman one, but to take the place of the empire in Gaul, to succeed to its heritage, to re-establish its authority, under Frankish kings. Thus when the empire of the West had ceased to be, the Frankish kings sought titles and alliances from the emperors who still ruled at Constantinople. It is a significant characteristic, indeed, of the Merwing monarchy that it kept up close relations with the distant Roman empire in the East, and that the Frankish kings professed to be the loyal allies, as they were often the formally adopted sons, of the Roman emperors, and the consuls of the republic.

Early in the seventh century, from 628 to 638, there ruled in Gaul Dagobert, the greatest of the Merwing kings. His rule extended from the Pyrenees to the North Sea, from the ocean to the forests of Thuringia and Bohemia. He was 'ruler of all Gaul and the greater part of Germany, very influential in the affairs of Spain, victorious over Slaves and Bulgarians, and at home a great king, encouraging commerce and putting into better shape the law codes of his subjects.'

¹ Gasquet, *L'Empire Byzantin et la Monarchie Franque*, p. 97.

That was the culmination of the Merwing power. The seventh century saw its decay, and a new step towards the mediæval monarchy of the Franks. Two causes effected the fall of the Merwings—their own vices and the growth of feudalism with the creation of great local lords. These threatened to break up the kingdom of Chlodowech into small States, to disintegrate and thus destroy the united nation of the Franks.

This was averted by the rise of a new and greater family, that of the Carlings. It was formed by the union of the two great houses whose possessions were in the Rhine valley. When its leaders had succeeded in making themselves practically hereditary prime ministers—mayors of the palace—to the Merwings they began to reunite the domains which had begun to split off from the centre. The great dominion of the Franks tended to divide into two—(1) the East Franks, in the land where Roman influence had almost entirely disappeared, and (2) the West Franks, where the Roman civilization and tradition lingered. The first was called Austrasia, the second Neustria. It was the task of the Carlings to reunite them. Pippin of Heristal did this, and he bore the title of leader of all the Franks—'Dux Francorum,' Duke of the Franks. Under Pippin and Charles Martel (the latter 714-741) the Carlings were the real rulers of all Gaul and the saviours of Europe and of Christianity from the Mohammedan Arabs.

Pippin the Short, 741-768, took two further steps. He reformed, with the aid of our own missionary, Winfrid (St. Boniface) and of the Popes, the Church system of his land; and he obtained full and final recognition as the King of the Franks in 751, deposing the Merwings, and becoming undisputed sovereign by his crowning 'both with German and with Christian rites, raised on the shield of the warrior after the old fashion, and consecrated with holy oil, as no Frankish king had been before him.' Within half a century the son of Pippin revived the dignity of Roman Emperor, and was crowned at Rome on Christmas Day 800. We need not dwell on the story of Charles the Great. It has been told and retold recently with abundance of detail.¹ The next date of importance in our subject is 843, the treaty of Verdun, when the great empire of Charles was split up and the modern kingdom of France was founded—geographically at

¹ See the last volumes of Dr. Hodgkins's *Italy and her Invaders*, *Charlemagne*, by the same writer, and *The Age of Charlemagne*, by Professor Wells of Minnesota.

least.
marize
ability
their p
feudali
did A
Anjou
local d
House
House
Franks

' by slow
smaller
could b
Carling
the old
of their
powerful
First al
no atten
called h
fell alm
Franks a
their ow
dynasty
France,

The
French
the less
augurat
under th
Church
Hugh
Rheims,
and wit
it effecti

Hug
country
Beauce,
Châlons,
were th
could ha
two lang

least. The history of the Carlings must be briefly summarized. The successors of the great kings had none of their ability; the invasions of the Northmen seriously crippled their power; the weakness of the central monarchy caused feudalism to expand and develop. Normandy split off; so did Aquitaine, Toulouse, Brittany, Flanders, Burgundy, Anjou, Auvergne, and many smaller States; and besides the local dynasties which ruled in these districts there arose the House which was to reunite the scattered districts—the House of Robert the Strong, Count of Paris and Duke of the Franks. Then

'by slow degrees the whole kingdom divided itself into larger or smaller feudal States. It did so because protection and security could be got in no other way; but the result was fatal to the Carling dynasty. They were trying to carry on the government on the old lines, not upon feudal principles, and they had no resources of their own with which they could meet and hope to overcome the powerful dukes and counts whom they had themselves created. First almost the whole south of Gaul, below the Loire, began to pay no attention whatever to the King of the Franks, though its lords still called him their sovereign. And then the last two or three Carlings fell almost as completely under the control of the Dukes of the Franks as the shadow Merwing kings had been under the control of their own ancestors. This was the rise of a new dynasty—the dynasty which still survives, and still claims the right to rule in France, the House of Hugh Capet, son of Robert the Strong.'¹

The year 987 is thus a critical date, the beginning of the French monarchy as the Middle Ages knew it. But none the less at the moment it was not a new era that was inaugurated. The royal authority, decayed and enfeebled under the later Carlings, could not recover at once. The Church and the feudal barons were the real power in Gaul. Hugh Capet, chosen and crowned by an Archbishop of Rheims, was only a baron, invested with the title of king and with the royal prerogative, but incapable of exercising it effectively outside his own domain.²

Hugh Capet and his immediate successors ruled only the country round Paris and Orleans, the Ile de France, Brie, Beauce, Beauvaisis, Valois. The bishops of Beauvais, Noyon, Châlons, Laon, Langres, and the great Archbishop of Rheims were the King's supporters. His own baronial vassals he could hardly restrain. France was split into north and south, two languages, two races, two civilizations.

¹ Adams, *Growth of the French Nation*, adapted, pp. 52-3.

² M. Luchaire, in M. Lavissee's *Histoire de France*, ii. 5.

Outside the immediate control of the Kings of the Franks were the great States, nominally vassal but practically independent, of Flanders, Normandy, Blois and Champagne, Anjou, Brittany, Burgundy; southwards Aquitaine, Gascony, Toulouse, Barcelona, all with separate dynasties, all ready to split off altogether from the Frankish centre, all in turn bitter foes of the kings. It is from the conflicts between these families and the strong House, growing stronger every year, of Hugh the king, that the dramatic interest of French history for three hundred years comes.

But, gaining here, losing there, it was only gradually that the Frankish royal House rose superior to these local dynasties. There is nothing in its position with regard to them that explains its final triumph; for that we must seek elsewhere.

First, the character of the monarchy itself, its principle, the central thought of it. This was not, as we have been often told, a feudal idea. Though the Capets possessed great fiefs their monarchy was not feudal. The election of a new dynasty was no feudal design of weakening the central power and establishing local independence. The Capets themselves were holders of great fiefs; they were able, as their predecessors had not been, to found a compact royal domain of their own. They succeeded precisely because they possessed what their predecessors had lacked. Thus in a sense the power of the new dynasty was due to feudalism; but it was not feudalism which made a change of dynasty necessary. The great nobles were far from being the friends of the new House. They were enmeshed in the system, but they rose above it.

‘En effet, par la force des choses, la royauté capétienne se trouvait dès le début engagée dans le système féodal, mais cette situation, contradictoire en bien des points avec ses origines et ses tendances naturelles, était beaucoup mieux déterminée et plus réelle dans l’esprit des feudataires que dans les conceptions propres des rois . . . S’il [the King] cherchait à bénéficier, autant que possible, de sa situation féodale, il s’est toujours considéré, d’autre part, comme investi d’un pouvoir bien supérieur à celui de la suzeraineté, si haute et si générale qu’on la suppose.’¹

The character of the monarchy was not feudal. It was imperial, absolute, like that of the Carlings. The monarchical idea had in fact been transmitted without break; and the accession of Hugh Capet marked only a dynastic, not a political or a social revolution. Nothing was founded anew. What

¹ Luchaire, *Institutions Monarchiques*, i. 51.

the C
princi
the Cap
the two
remain
power
many c
lute in
dignitie
Imperia
its sove
siders t
chronic
sovereig
whole k
affairs o

Elec
king to
the kin
could g
monarch
remain

Seco
growth
with the
the heir
period
accessio
said, the
came in
fixed ru
lifetime
followed
Louis
distresse
crown;
It is cur
ture: R
son died
was the
the grea
heredity
the for
through,
number,

the Carlings had claimed as kings, that exactly, in principle, the Capets received. Consecrated by the Church, the Capets considered themselves the legitimate successors of the two previous dynasties. The Frankish monarchy, then, remained in idea that enfeebled reproduction of the imperial power which had lingered on, or filtered down, through so many centuries of alternate decay and revival. It was absolute in principle. It claimed to be the source of all rights and dignities. What it knew of Roman law and the rights of the Imperial throne it endeavoured to carry out in the exercise of its sovereignty. One of the first French writers who considers the theory of monarchy, Abbo, abbat of Fleury, the chronicler of Hugh Capet, is careful to define the power as sovereign. 'The duty,' he says, 'of the king is to govern the whole kingdom.' Thus 'it needs a complete knowledge of the affairs of the whole realm, for the repression of all iniquity.'

Elective the monarchy still was, and it was a duty of the king to consult the magnates; but absolute, when crowned, the king became; and he could rule absolutely, if only he could get his barons to submit. The inherent meaning of monarchy, the traditional conception of the royal power, remained the chief strength of the Frankish kings.

Secondly, a constant accession of strength came from the growth of the hereditary principle. And this was combined with the custom, which Hugh Capet introduced, of crowning the heir during the lifetime of the reigning sovereign. The period between the deposition of Charles the Great and the accession of Hugh Capet had been, M. Luchaire has truly said, the period, *par excellence*, of election. The new dynasty came in with the determination to change this, to create a fixed rule of succession. Hugh had his son crowned in his lifetime as the 'consort of his realm.' The example was followed by his successors Robert II., Henry I., Philip I., Louis VI. Louis VII. went through many matrimonial distresses in the hope of procuring a son whom he could crown; and not long before his death he obtained his wish. It is curious that at first there was no custom of primogeniture: Robert II. doubted whether to crown, when his eldest son died, his son Henry or his son Robert. Partition, indeed, was the old Teutonic custom, and it still obtained in some of the greater fiefs of the crown. But while the doctrine of heredity was coming more and more prominently forward the form of election was still, for two centuries, gone through, in the presence of a number, often an attenuated number, of barons. 'The policy of the Capets ended by

destroying the system of election, in favour of hereditary succession, by the very means of election itself. . . . A constantly repeated election, for the benefit of the same family, became merely a formal recognition of the right of the heir.' By the time of Philip Augustus the hereditary succession was firmly established. He was the first king who departed from the custom of crowning his heir.

A third reason has already been alluded to. It was the great possessions of the Capetian House and the fiefs of which they were the immediate lords. What exactly were the limits of the possessions of the House of Robert the Strong it seems impossible to discover. Here and there a charter shows them as lords in a land where we did not know that they had any direct associations. Not only round Paris, where there was no exact and compact land of the Duke of the Franks, but rather a number of manors more or less closely related to each other and to the overlord, but also all over the country between the Seine and the Loire, in the south, in Poitou, and in the northern provinces too, lay towns and lordships which enriched the king as their direct proprietor. The Frankish kings from the end of the tenth century were more than the equals, in their private possessions, of the greatest of their feudal vassals.

And their possessions led to the creation, and the use, of a valuable instrument for the enlargement of the royal power. As feudalism developed into an organization of society, as all offices became fiefs, the direct power of the crown gradually became restricted to the royal domain; and when the evolution of feudalism was complete the king, as the French writers epigrammatically put it, 'had no longer either functionaries or administration.' But this never actually happened. It was the logical result of feudalism; but then how rarely we reach logical results! The kings continued to have what was more than nominally a hierarchy of officials; besides this they made use of the bishops and the abbats. But gradually the Capets created a new local administration. The *prévôts*, appointed in every place where the king had a town, and held accountable for every branch of the royal revenue collected locally, spread over the country. At every town the local lord was met by the royal official; and in the inevitable conflict, step by step, the royal official won. First he won for his master. In justice, in finance, in local government of every kind the *prévôts* stood forward to explain, and decide, and suggest, and satisfy the difficulties out of which way could be made for the king to enter into a

large
addre
Cape
mere
bran
every
spoke
small
the fi
T
func
was
confl
senta
which
despo
tion.
not n
F
for th
has b
M. A
other
T
dyna
for th
the g
' I
avec
intrig
au be
clairer
lingier
pouvo
A
impor
But r
states
great
C
at ev
1 p
2 B
duction
Derni

larger field of authority. Hundreds and hundreds of charters addressed to the *prévôts* remain of the period of the early Capets. M. Léopold Delisle has made a thick volume of a mere brief analysis of those of Philip Augustus. In every branch of political administration they interfered; and in every case the king gained. The royal power no longer spoke through great vassals. It came intimately close to the small barons, the traders, the merchants, even the tillers of the field.

Then came the inevitable conflict between the royal functionaries and the lords of the soil: and the result of it was satisfactory to the crown. But this was followed by a conflict between the sovereign authority and its own representatives—a conflict which lasted for 200 years, and from which the Crown only emerged victorious in the period of despotism which immediately preceded the great Revolution. It is an interesting study, but one on which we may not now linger.

Four causes have been mentioned which helped to win for the Frankish monarchy its dominance over Gaul. A fifth has been dwelt upon by recent historians, and notably by M. Achille Luchaire, as more important than any of the others. It is the help and influence of the Church.

The election of Hugh Capet himself, the change of dynasty which substituted the House of Robert the Strong for the House of Charles the Great, was due to the Church, the guardian of national unity.

‘Depuis quelques années Hugues avait noué des intelligences avec le prélat de Reims et avec son secrétaire, Gerbert. Ces deux intrigants lui promettaient l'appui du premier évêché de France et, au besoin, le concours de la puissance impériale. Ils voyaient clairement que la force et la faveur populaire s'éloignaient du Carolingien pour se tourner vers le duc à qui appartenait la réalité du pouvoir. L'Eglise les suivit volontiers.’¹

Adalbero gave the support of the great see of Rheims, important politically, constitutionally, and geographically. But more important was the help of the great ecclesiastical statesman who as Sylvester II. was to become one of the greatest of mediæval popes.²

Coming into power by an ecclesiastical influence, opposed at every step by a feudalism of growing influence and

¹ Lavisse, *Histoire de France*, ii. 145.

² For the influence of Gerbert in this connection see Havet, Introduction to his edition of the *Letters of Gerbert* (1889), and Lot, *Les Derniers Carolingiens*.

extension, the Frankish monarchy was thrown from the first on the support of the Church. The Church supplied the great ministers of the Crown. The king's clerks were ecclesiastics: the government for 200 years was almost entirely in their hands. Through the mists of the Middle Ages there shines forth the grand figure of Suger, abbat of St. Denys, the great regent, the organizer of victory, the saviour of the monarchy during dangerous days. The position of this truly great man, priest, statesman, diplomatist, historian, is only an illustration—though it is the most striking one—of the power of the heads of the great ecclesiastical foundations in Frankish politics. The rise of feudalism had knit the churches more closely to the king, and taught them to seek in him the one stable authority which should be strengthened to stand against the baronage. The baronage was to the Church as a class of robbers and oppressors. Law and protection could only emanate from the Crown. The Crown must be strengthened to make the law and the protection effective. On this view throughout all the early Middle Ages the French Church consistently acted. The local churches, monasteries and the like constantly declared that they owned no other lord save the king; and by the lavish support they gave him they acted up to their profession. The royal power of *régale*, vague, undefined, but extremely important during the vacancy of a see, tended continually to increase the king's authority in the provinces of Rheims, Tours, Sens, Bourges, and Lyons. France, too, was free from the disturbance which in other countries made havoc of friendliness between Church and king. The contest concerning investitures never spread to Gaul. The oath of fealty was always received by the kings from the bishops after consecration; and no controversy was created by Papal or ecclesiastical sensitiveness. The kings managed to keep a hold upon the election to bishoprics and great abbeys. Here the Papacy did its best to oppose, but with very little success. Protests against simony were too generally unheeded. The Crown, too, generally tried to keep the Church unreformed; to keep the bishops subservient through care for their temporal interests. It must be remembered also that during the early Middle Ages the feudal principles had gradually encroached upon the ecclesiastical even in its own home: abbeys had been laicized, feudalized; the king himself from patron, protector, advocate of certain abbeys, became actually their lay abbat. He was abbat of St. Martin at Tours, of St. Germain des Prés, of St. Germain d'Auxerre,

of M
it is
actual
less r
power
more
suppo
M. L
three
the ki
his co
larges
contin
the la
reco
repay
A
munc
spran
centu
the a
geois,
libert
const
jurisd
urban
privil
great
Chan
histor
In
chang
was t
Cape
The
Marc
obtai
contr
large
by w
heirs
point
no co
city
with

of Morienvall, and of other abbeys. The monastic reform, it is true, compelled the retirement of laymen from the actual government of the abbeys; but the kings none the less retained a strong influence within their walls. But if the power of the kings over monasteries was not slight, much more powerful was it over the churches at large. And the support of the Church was loyal and whole-hearted. M. Luchaire has shown that the Church aided the Crown in three ways—(1) politically: bishops and abbats were often the king's ministers, and they always formed the majority of his counsellors; (2) financially: the Church bore by far the largest part of the taxation; (3) in military service: the contingents furnished by the ecclesiastical estate were always the largest part of the royal forces. Chronicler after chronicler records how the abbeys sent their tenants to the wars, to repay the protection which the kings had bestowed on them.

A sixth cause may be found in the growth of the communes, and in the relation of the Crown to them. New towns sprang up all over Gaul in the tenth and eleventh and twelfth centuries; they were founded with special privileges, first by the abbeys, secondly by the kings. Serfs rose to be *bourgeois*, and *bourgeois* soon sought political privilege and civil liberty. As in England so in France every variety of urban constitution, every variety of position as to administration, jurisdiction, taxation, military service, is found among the urban constitutions. Paris, like London, was unique in its privileges. It was also unique in the power possessed by the great corporations of the Marchands de l'Eau, Bouchers, Changeurs, Regrattiers, Cordonniers. Of these the first has a history almost unparalleled in Europe.

In Paris the ancient company of the Nautæ Parisienses, changing its name to Mercatores Aquæ (Marchands de l'Eau), was the recipient of the numerous charters and privileges of the Capetian kings which were the foundation of the municipality. The first document which recognizes the privileges of the Marchands de l'Eau is a grant of Louis le Gros in 1121. They obtained under this king and under Louis VII. the entire control of the Seine, and formed a corporation which exacted large sums from merchants of other places for sending goods by water. Hugh Capet had been Count of Paris. When his heirs became kings they were represented by *prevôts*, appointed, it would seem, down to the thirteenth century, for no consideration but that of their fitness for the office. The city remained under royal control, like a town in demesne, without corporate privileges; but the Marchands de l'Eau were

recognized as a corporate body with whom the king could enter into personal relations. No permanent municipality appears till the reign of St. Louis, who, at the time of the appointment of Etienne Boileau, seems to have recognized a corporation of the city. This corporation, however, was at once the guild of the merchants and the municipality, and the head was both *prévôt du roi* and *prévôt des marchands*.¹

It was long before the kings allowed encroachments on the special privileges they had conferred, or perceived that they might themselves gain by a greater freedom of trade. Only gradually was there division between the king and his chief city; only gradually did Paris become the hereditary enemy of the Crown. At present, at the time of which we speak, the principle of association worked, on the whole, in favour of the royal authority.

For the royal support of the communes three reasons have been assigned—military, pecuniary, and political; the aid of the burgher forces, the dues from the burgher purses, and the alliance of the burgher corporations against the great prelates and the great barons. In each of these ways (though their military importance has been exaggerated) the communes were of real and active assistance to the Crown.

A further reason for the triumph of the monarchy may be found in the influence of literature. This, we are aware, may easily be exaggerated. But the trend of thought is evidenced by the Realistic Philosophy, by the study of Roman Law, and by the popular romance writers. The Realistic Philosophy demanded a concrete embodiment of the idea of Monarchy, of absolute power. The students of Roman Law attributed to the kings all the powers of the Roman emperors. Almost as important was the growth of semi-historical romance.

‘It was the delight of the literary men who formed part of the court of Philip the Conqueror to compare him with Charles the Great. No analogies were too fanciful, no legends too precarious, to be used in the process which surrounded the thirteenth-century Augustus with the romantic environment of the reviver of the Empire.’²

The lost *Karolid* was an elaborate comparison of Charles to Philip; the *Philippid* too, the other work of William the Breton, is full of allusions to the romantic connexion of the Monarchy with the past history of Gaul and Rome.

¹ This represents practically the conclusion of M. Robiquet, *Histoire Municipale de Paris*, chap. i. See also Perry’s *Saint Louis*.

² Hutton’s *Philip Augustus*, p. 138.

One final cause may be briefly touched upon. It is the personal influence of the monarchs. Louis VI. and Louis VII. in different ways advanced the monarchy. Philip the Conqueror, by intrigue, by conquest, by the crowning glory of Bouvines, by his astute use of the Albigenian crusade, changed the whole face of Gaul, and left the King of the Franks indisputable sovereign of by far the greater part of the land.

There could hardly be a greater contrast to Philip Augustus than his saintly grandson. With him came the moral force which the earlier sovereign so conspicuously lacked. Living in a period of moral awakening, he was himself the most conspicuous example of life lived simply in accord with the Christian ideal. With St. Francis there came again into the world the simplicity of Christian love and Christian sacrifice. 'Preach peace to all,' he said, and he lived to do it. St. Dominic, whom we more readily forget, was a true brother worker. The Church awoke to the beauty of her work, the holiness of her life, the tremendous necessity of the call laid upon her. And she found in the court of the Frankish monarchy a perfect example of answer to the call.

St. Louis comes to us first as a crusader, as one who gave his life to win back 'the land of Christ' from the infidel. Perfectly fearless, chivalrous, and unselfish, he offered himself without second thought to the work. From August 1248 to September 1254 he was in Egypt and in Palestine, fighting, defeated, captured, released, hardly winning a single ostensible advantage, but at least keeping back for many years the tide of Moslem success, and conspicuously showing the virtues of a Christian hero and a noble knight. Again, twenty-two years later, he gave himself to the cause. Diverted to Tunis, his expedition began that conquest of Northern Africa which in our own day has given Algeria to France. And he gave his life for the cause of Christ. Misled, deluded he may have been; but of his absolute sincerity there can be no shadow of doubt. This sincerity appears, too, in his dealings with England. At every point, in the issue of many years of war, he was victorious. He preferred to make a friend of his vanquished foe. Joinville tells the tale, in his inimitable way, of how the saintly king tried to heal the age-long breach with England. This action, and his life-long devotion to the Crusade, are illustrations of his work.

But they are equally illustrations of his character. The work of St. Louis for the French monarchy was the influence

of his pure and devoted life. No one who has studied it can fail to speak of it with enthusiasm. Even Gibbon silences his moral scepticism, and uses, after a passing sneer, the noblest words that he applies to any man.

'Twenty-eight years after his death he was canonized at Rome, and sixty-five miracles were readily found and attested to justify the claims of the royal saint. The voice of history renders a more honourable testimony—that he united the virtues of a king, a hero, and a man; that his martial spirit was tempered by the love of private and public justice; and that Louis was the father of his people, the friend of his neighbours, and the terror of the infidels.'

Character, in the Middle Ages, was an enormous force; and it was, in the long run, character which made the Frankish monarchy what it became. The journalist who invented the last words of the Abbé Edgeworth to Louis XVI. on the scaffold had an instinct of genius. It was the character of St. Louis, more than anything else, which rooted the monarchy in the affections of the French people for five hundred years.

ART. IV.—JOHN WESLEY'S JOURNAL.

The Works of the Rev. John Wesley. Vols. I.–VI. Comprising 'An Extract from the Rev. John Wesley's Journal.' (London, 1809–10.)

FOR ten readers of Pepys and three readers of Evelyn there is probably but one reader of Wesley. Most intelligent men, not professed Methodists, do not so much as know that he published a Journal. Not long ago a paper was read on some points of Wesley's opinions to a society mainly composed of English clergymen, who with one voice demanded how the reader had obtained his matter. Even professed Methodists have often very scanty knowledge of their founder's works. The easiest way of accounting for the neglect of the general public is the supposition that a hazy notion got about that Wesley's Journal could only be of interest to those who, in the old Methodist phraseology, 'are of the household of faith, or are groaning so to be.' It was classed, first of all, as a 'good' book, and then as a 'good' book of a sectarian tendency, and thus the general reader passed it by. The writer would probably not have been acquainted with it had he not inherited a set of Wesley's works from a 'good old

Method
Many
Sunday
the P
old vol
mingle
by a v
the ap

To
and e
activit
times
tion o
but it
great
those
rather
detail,
figure
as nee
graver
many
will e
thodis
Hump
he wis
conce
infla
is not
fully
less n
all W
perfec
self, s
exact

Y
of Pe
In re
over
randa
his J
instal
a spa
were
proba

Methodist ancestry,' that is to say, from a great-grandfather. Many hours of childhood, especially in the long and sleepy Sunday afternoons, when *Robinson Crusoe* was forbidden and the *Pilgrim's Progress* had grown stale, have the battered old volumes beguiled, holding the little reader captive by the mingled charm of adventure and religious mystery, heightened by a vivid sense of the supernatural, and not untouched by the apprehension of eternal woe.

To the reader of mature age the book is one of interest and even fascination. It is the record of the unwearied activity and beneficence of the busiest man that modern times have seen. It not only displays his peculiar presentation of Christian truth with great force and attractiveness, but it states the judgment of a vigorous mind on many of the great questions of his day; it betrays a sufficient measure of those little foibles without which the best of men is admired rather than loved; and it delineates, here and there in curious detail, the manner of life of a period which the well-loved figure of Samuel Johnson has endeared to us. It is almost as necessary as Boswell to the right understanding of the graver side of eighteenth century social life—indeed, it supplies many aspects lacking to that work. Without it the student will entirely fail to comprehend the features of early Methodism, and will run the risk of mistaking the caricature of *Humphrey Clinker* for a resemblance of the truth; while if he wishes to supplement the witness of Boswell to the serious concerns of the time, he may be misled by the pompous and inflated periods of the professional moralists, whose inflation is not of style only, but of thought as well. In an age which fully needed the injunction to clear the mind of cant, no man less needed it than did John Wesley. For the great merit of all Wesley's writing is its naturalness—the naturalness of a perfectly sincere mind, of one, who, 'so far as he knew himself, strove only to please God,' and to appear to everyone exactly as he was.

Yet the naturalness of Wesley differs from the naturalness of Pepys, entirely apart from the difference in the two men. In reading Pepys we are in the delightful position of looking over the diarist's shoulder as he jots down his private memoranda of the transactions of the day, but Wesley transcribed his Journal for publication. It was published by him in instalments of varying length, but containing on an average a space of about two and a half years: of these parts twenty were put out by Wesley himself, the first without date, but probably in 1739, and the twentieth in 1789. The twenty-

first and last part of his Journal was published after his death. The reasons which led him to make his Journal public are set forth in the preface to the first part. (There are prefaces to the first four parts and to the twelfth only.) It was about the year 1724, he there says, that he began to keep an exact account of how he spent his time, and when he left England for Georgia, the variety of the scenes he then passed through induced him to transcribe the more material parts of his diary, with the addition of suitable reflections. Of the Journal thus made he now publishes a short extract. There are thus evidently three stages in the composition of his published Journal, at least in the earlier years. 1. The rough diary, posted up in shorthand from day to day. 2. A private journal, written from the former, apparently at various intervals, with comments and reflections. 3. An extract of such passages in the private journal as Wesley thought it advisable to publish. From the fact that he speaks of a 'short extract,' it is to be inferred that the manuscript journal is much more copious than the printed one. As the original documents still exist, and are now in the hands of the Methodist authorities, we trust they will consider the seemliness of enlarging the portions printed in the reissue which is in preparation. It would be an outrage to reveal the nakedness of a gentleman's privacy; we want no scandal, no stories of his wife dragging him across the room by the hair; but anything which throws additional light on Wesley's character and opinions, on his intercourse with contemporaries, or on the manners of the time, would be highly acceptable.

It is plain that Wesley's purpose in publishing extracts from his Journal was mainly didactic. It was one way of preaching the Gospel, and of satisfying objectors to his view of Gospel truth. This is frankly avowed in the lengthy preface to the third instalment of the Journal published in 1742. The two quotations following are sufficient. 'What I design in the following Extract is, openly to declare to all mankind what it is that the Methodists (so called) have done, and are doing now. Or rather, what it is that God hath done, and is still doing in our land.' Again, after mentioning objections and misrepresentations based on extraordinary manifestations accompanying his preaching, 'A bare recital of those facts which were not done in a corner is the best answer to this sort of objections. To those which have been judged to be of more weight, I have occasionally given a more particular answer.'

The earlier numbers in their original intention are thus

largely
justifica
establis
the lat
until in
those c
But it
interes
though
who si
comple
is neit
into ot
his doc
with v
plain,
the A
format
For h
Prayer
and fo
moder
custom

Th
tion f
agent
under
Indian
pictur
to En
close
the sp
open-
from t
Metho
Journ
labour
entry
us) is
before
tinuou
ends,
one e
throu
Wesl

largely of the nature of an Apologia; they are Wesley's justification of his teaching and practice. As Methodism established itself and as the violence of opposition died down, the later numbers gradually lose this apologetic character, until in the final years almost the only polemical features are those directed against the unruly among his own people. But it is this very fact which gives to the Journal its supreme interest, for it enables us to trace the progress of Wesley's thought in great fulness and detail, insomuch that the reader who sits down to study Wesley's Journal has before him a complete conspectus of early Methodism. Early Methodism is neither more nor less than the mind of Wesley projected into other people. Not that he claimed originality for either his doctrine or his discipline; he disclaimed any such thing with vehemence. He considered himself to be reviving the plain, original principles of Christianity, as first laid down in the Apostolic age, and as restated at the time of the Reformation, but thereafter buried under many years of neglect. For his doctrinal positions he constantly appealed to the Prayer Book, Articles, and Homilies of the Church of England; and for those points of discipline in which he varied from the modern Anglican practice, he sought his authority in the customs of the Primitive Church.

The printed Journal opens with Mr. Wesley's embarkation for the colony of Georgia, whither he was going as an agent of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, and under the wing of General Oglethorpe, to minister to the Indian natives. His way of life while there is very fully pictured, together with the reasons which led him to return to England in little more than two years. Then follow his close connection with the Moravian settlement in London, the spiritual crisis usually known as his conversion, his first open-air preaching, his disagreement with and separation from the Moravians, and the establishment of the first strictly Methodist societies. From that time (1740) onward the Journal is a continued record of Mr. Wesley's unintermitted labours and of the fortunes of his new societies. The last entry published (whether the last made or not is unknown to us) is dated October 20, 1790, little more than four months before his death. The only gap of any length in the continuous story is from October 28, 1754, where the ninth number ends, to April 1, 1755. Between these dates there is only one entry, and before this, during the latter part of 1753 and through 1754, the entries are scanty. During this period Wesley was suffering from serious illness, being thought to

be in a consumption. For ten months he never preached abroad, and but seldom in church or room. The entry of October 28, 1754, is the copy of a letter to an unnamed baronet, in which Wesley speaks of himself equally with the man he is addressing, as on the borders of the grave. It was during this long illness that he composed the well-known epitaph describing himself as a 'brand plucked from the burning,' and declaring that after his debts were paid he did not leave 10*l*. behind him, which was true almost to the letter when he actually died nearly forty years later.

Some notion of the distances covered and the amount of work done during the fifty years of missionary travels which the Journal records may be gathered from two extracts. On May 14, 1765, he remarks in a letter to a friend, 'I preach about eight hundred sermons in a year'; and on June 28, 1774, his seventy-second birthday, he attributes his health and strength to these causes:

'The grand cause is the good pleasure of God, Who doth whatsoever pleaseth Him. The chief means are: (1) My constantly rising at four, for about fifty years; (2) My generally preaching at five in the morning, one of the most healthy exercises in the world; (3) My never travelling less, by sea or land, than four thousand five hundred miles in a year.'

When we realize that this enormous mileage was traversed in his younger days on horseback, in his old age in a chaise, and that through all weathers, and over the vilest roads, we perceive something of the spirit which animated the man. In his old age he complains of the dreadful state of the north-east Lancashire roads, particularly about the neighbourhood of Haslingden, as being sufficient to lame any horse and shake any carriage in pieces, and he adds the *nota bene*, 'I will never attempt to travel these roads again till they are effectually mended.' Many of them never have been mended, but remain to-day the same as, or worse than, they were when Wesley wrote; new and excellent highways having been made with easier gradients and keeping more to the valleys, and the old roads, which climb a hill wherever they find one, having been long disused. These neglected ways, which abound in north-east Lancashire and the adjacent parts of the West Riding, are a fair sample of many of the roads of England before the coaching era. A very interesting account of a winter journey, on good roads, as roads then were, is found on February 16, 1747, and two following days. On that day Wesley set out from London for the north; the

passage
here gi

'I w
such as
ceased:
hard an
panions
hour, we
full in o
storm be
faces tha
two o'clo
safe to K

'Tud
really ha
or break
much ad
higher a
Howeve
in the m
hail as v
and sma
our eyeb
we came
'We

falling fa
blast to
But here
Sometim
than an
get as fa
sunset o
Brig-cast

'Wed
no travel
that the
walk twe
name of
sword, an
main roa
horsebac
Grimsby
them (fo
rest we s
clergyman
We reach

'Thu
difficulty
the dyke

passages which bear upon the weather and the travelling are here given :

'I was wondering the day before at the mildness of the weather, such as seldom attends me in my journies. But my wonder now ceased : the wind was turned full north, and blew so exceedingly hard and keen, that when we came to Hatfield, neither my companions nor I had much use of our hands or feet. After resting an hour, we bore up again, through the wind and snow, which drove full in our faces. But this was only a squall. In Baldock Field the storm began in earnest. The large hail drove so vehemently in our faces that we could not see, nor hardly breathe. However, before two o'clock we reached Baldock, where one met and conducted us safe to Potten.

'Tuesday, 17, we set out as soon as it was well light. But it was really hard work to get forward. For the frost would not well bear or break. And the untracked snow covering all the roads, we had much ado to keep our horses on their feet. Meantime the wind rose higher and higher, till it was ready to overturn both man and beast. However, after a short bait at Bugden we pushed on, and were met in the middle of an open field with so violent a storm of rain and hail as we had not had before. It drove through our coats, great and small, boots, and everything, and yet froze as it fell, even upon our eyebrows, so that we had scarce strength or motion left, when we came into our inn at Stilton.

'We now gave up our hopes of reaching Grantham, the snow falling faster and faster. However, we took the advantage of a fair blast to set out, and made the best of our way to Stamford Heath. But here a new difficulty arose, from the snow lying in large drifts. Sometimes horse and man were well nigh swallowed up. Yet in less than an hour we were brought safe to Stamford. Being willing to get as far as we could, we made but a short stop here ; and about sunset came, cold and weary, yet well, to a little town called Brig-casterton.

'Wednesday, 18, our servant came up and said, "Sir, there is no travelling to-day. Such a quantity of snow has fallen in the night that the roads are quite filled up." I told him, "At least we can walk twenty miles a day, with our horses in our hands." So in the name of God we set out. The north-east wind was piercing as a sword, and had driven the snow into such uneven heaps, that the main road was not passable. However, we kept on, a-foot or on horseback, till we came to the White Lion at Grantham. Some from Grimsby had appointed to meet us here, but not hearing anything of them (for they were at another house by mistake), after an hour's rest we set out straight for Epworth. On the road we overtook a clergyman and his servant ; but the toothache quite shut my mouth. We reached Newark about five.

'Thursday, 19, the frost was not so sharp ; so that we had little difficulty till we came to Haxey-Car. But here the ice which covered the dykes, and great part of the common, would not bear, nor readily

break. Nor did we know, there being no track of man or beast, what part of the dykes were fordable. However, we committed ourselves to God, and went on. We hit all our fords exactly, and, without any fall or considerable hindrance, came to Epworth in two hours, full as well as when we left London.'

The spiritual aspect of Wesley's work is not touched on in this article, though, as has been said, it is this which gives to the *Journal* its supreme interest : but the book is such that its main feature may be neglected, and yet many others deeply attractive may remain.

For one thing, the *Journal* is a perfect mine of stories of the supernatural, none of them, perhaps, of the highest rank of authenticity, but making up by their number and variety for what they lack in that respect. Miraculous answers to prayer, providential escapes from imminent peril, faith-healing, death-warnings, instances as of demoniac possession, witchcraft, visions of the world unseen, interviews with damned spirits, jostle one another in these pages. By far the fullest case narrated is that of Elizabeth Hobson of Sunderland, which occupies many printed pages, and is much too long to quote as a whole. This woman professed to have had from childhood visions of those who died, either as they were departing, or a little before. Some of her experiences she related to Mr. Wesley, whose full belief is indicated by the artless notes he has appended to her story. Elizabeth in her childhood lived with an uncle who was evidently a man signally conversant with the spiritual world. One of his maxims she repeated to Wesley, by whom it was received with grave respect, 'Evil spirits seldom appear but between eleven at night and two in the morning. But after they have appeared to a person a year, they frequently come in the daytime. Whenever spirits, good or bad, come in the day, they come at sunrise, at noon, or at sunset.' Wesley's note on this is, 'How strange is this ! But how little do we know concerning the laws of the invisible world.' This same uncle, after his death, which happened when she was about sixteen, took to visiting her in answer to her prayers, appearing about eleven o'clock in an evening, and staying until cockcrow. He never spoke to her, nor she to him, but, she being ill at the time, whenever she wanted to drink, he anticipated her wishes. His daily departure was attended with delightful music by invisible choirs. These visitations lasted all the while she was ill (the doubting will add—and delirious), and ceased at her recovery. The last time he came, however, he was not in his usual dress, but clothed in white from

head
clothe
Addit

La
his co
sweet
wards
began
by nig
spoke
of her
after h

La
then of
latter c
to a ho
took to
wicked
up by
proper
The st
express
Wesley
proper
ference
On her
Jamaica
in travel
grandfa
clothes
this one
Elizabeth
Wesley
divert t
never di

It v
space of
parts of
casually
together
of clairv

'Jona
relation :
neighbour
would no

head to foot; and about 1 A.M. was joined by another person clothed in white, taller than he, and exceedingly beautiful. Additional music was performed on this occasion.

Later in life (she was about twenty-four when Wesley had his conversation with her) she saw the apparition of her sweetheart the evening before he died, and a few days afterwards that of a neighbour, also a seafaring man. The latter began to visit her by day (at the three set times) as well as by night, and continued his visits for ten weeks. At last she spoke to him, and learnt that his purpose was to remind her of her promise, which apparently she was neglecting, to look after his fatherless children.

Later still she had a death-warning of one brother, and then of another; the former of whom was lost at sea, and the latter died in Jamaica. By these deaths she became entitled to a house, left to the family by a grandfather, who promptly took to haunting her himself. He had been an exceedingly wicked man, and the narrative presumes that he was allowed up by special permission from Tartarus to help her to get the property from her aunts, who were holding possession of it. The story is circumstantial, and interspersed with moving expressions of piety, but one wonders that it never struck Wesley that a petty family squabble about a little bit of property was hardly an occasion worthy of supernatural interference on so large a scale. Wesley's notes are very curious. On her relating the appearance of the brother who died in Jamaica, he gravely remarks, 'So, a spirit finds no difficulty in travelling three or four thousand miles in a moment.' The grandfather had an uncomfortable habit of pulling the bed-clothes off her when he appeared; on his beginning to do this one night, 'I tried to take his hand, but could not,' said Elizabeth; 'on which he shrunk back again and smiled.' Wesley's note is almost comical: 'Poor ghost! did this divert thee for a moment from attending to the worm that never dieth?'

It would be impossible to multiply examples in the space of a short article, and indeed these ghost stories are the parts of the Journal most probably read by those who only casually dip into it; but one more case may be extracted, together with Wesley's comment on it. This is a specimen of clairvoyance, under date July 24, 1761:

'Jonas Rushford, about fourteen years old, gave me the following relation: "About this time last year I was desired by two of our neighbours to go with them to Mr. Crowther's, at Skipton, who would not speak to *them*, about a man that had been missing twenty

weeks, but bid them bring a boy twelve or thirteen years old. When we came in, he stood reading a book. He put me into a bed, with a looking-glass in my hand, and covered me all over. Then he asked me, whom I had a mind to see ; and I said "my mother." I presently saw her with a lock of wool in her hand, standing just in the place, and the clothes she was in, as she told me afterwards. Then he bid me look again, for the man that was missing, who was one of our neighbours, and I looked and saw him riding towards Idle ; but he was very drunk, and he stopped at the alehouse, and drank two pints more ; and he pulled out a guinea to change. Two men stood by, a big man and a little man ; and they went on before him, and got two hedge-stakes. And when he came up on Windhill Common, at the top of the hill, they pulled him off his horse and killed him, and threw him into a coal-pit. And I saw it all as plainly as if I were close to them ; and if I saw the men, I should know them again. We went back to Bradford that night, and the next day I went with our neighbours, and showed them the spot where he was killed, and the pit into which he was thrown. And a man went down, and brought him up ; and it was as I had told them : his handkerchief was tied about his mouth, and fastened behind his neck."

'Is it improbable only, or flatly impossible, when all the circumstances are considered, that this should all be pure fiction? They can believe this, may believe a man's getting into a bottle.'

The last sentence might be ambiguous in another than Wesley ; in Wesley it means, 'those who can believe this account to be a pure fiction are capable of believing anything.'

It is often said that Wesley was exceedingly credulous, and the Journal gives great colour to the assertion. Elizabeth Hobson took the old man in as easily as a little child. Yet it must not be forgotten that it was a credulous age in respect of the supernatural, and that the huge intellect of Johnson was no less prone to easy acceptance of such stories than was that of Wesley. And the strange fact is that in matters outside of religious and cognate beliefs, Wesley was one of the most sceptical and incredulous of mankind. Three instances will amply illustrate the native bent of his mind. The first relates to his slowness to receive the conclusions of modern science. On January 1, 1765, he writes :

'This week I wrote an answer to a warm letter, published in the *London Magazine*, the author whereof is much displeased that I presume to doubt of the modern astronomy. I cannot help it. Nay, the more I consider, the more my doubts increase. So that, at present, I doubt whether any man on earth knows either the distance or magnitude, I will not say of a fixed star, but of Saturn, or Jupiter : yea, of the sun or moon.'

in
one

reason
Tarta
that t
land,
by th
centu
colleg
studen
at one
(July

A
caref
explor

'M
Voyag
was I
nation
sense
as mil
observ
a spec
of an
I know
rank
Tupia
ber 17

TI
and e
a Gos
sancti
natura
appar
receiv
mirac
accept
love, s
by a l
free fr
virtue
the G
was sa
of the

Take, again, this passage on the early history of Ireland, in which he couples the purely mythical with the historical in one general disbelief:

'I read Dr. Leland's *History of Ireland*; a fine writer, but unreasonably partial. I can easily believe that the Irish were originally Tartars or Scythians, though calling at Spain in their way: but not that they were a jot less barbarous than their descendants in Scotland, or that ever they were a civilized nation till they were civilized by the English; much less that Ireland was in the seventh or eighth century the grand seat of learning; that it had many famous colleges; in one of which only, Armagh, there were seven thousand students. All this, with St. Patrick's converting thirty thousand at one sermon, I rank with the History of Bel and the Dragon' (July 5, 1773).

A third extract (a few words omitted) will show how carefully he examined into the narratives of travellers in unexplored countries:

'Meeting with a celebrated book, a volume of *Captain Cook's Voyages*, I sat down to read it with great expectation; but how was I disappointed. I observed, 1, Things absolutely incredible: "A nation without any curiosity: and, what is stranger still, without any sense of shame . . . men whose skin, cheeks, and lips are white as milk." Hume or Voltaire might believe this; but I cannot. I observed, 2, Things absolutely impossible. To instance one, for a specimen. A native of Otaheite is said to understand the language of an island eleven hundred miles distant from it in latitude, besides I know not how many hundreds in longitude; so that I cannot but rank this narrative with that of Robinson Crusoe, and account Tupia to be, in several respects, akin to his man Friday' (December 17, 1773).

The fact is, that Wesley's credulity is perfectly natural and explicable. The Gospel which he preached was entirely a Gospel of the supernatural, not of supernatural origin and sanction merely, but supernatural in its present power: supernatural in exactly the same sense of the word in which an apparition of a deceased person is supernatural. Those who received the Gospel were supernaturally born again, and had miraculously granted to them a sensible assurance of their acceptance with God; they were supernaturally renewed in love, so that they who received this blessing knew themselves, by a Divinely given perception akin to a new sense, to be free from indwelling sin. The Methodist convert *felt* the virtue of Christ pour into his soul as the paralytic or leper of the Gospels felt that virtue renew his body. When Wesley was satisfied that any man had truly experienced these powers of the world to come, he was ready to believe whatever that

man told him, however wild and extravagant, provided that it in any way concerned spiritual life and experience, and did not contradict the general tenor of Scripture. Other men's pretensions he scrutinized with cool reason. Again, as *homo unius libri* he accepted that book with entirely uncritical mind, as did his believing contemporaries; but he differed from them in being ready to credit modern instances of marvels which both acknowledged as happening in Bible times. We are not astonished, therefore, to find him disposed to allow some credibility to modern ecclesiastical miracles, despite his dread of Popery. But any wonder not agreeable to Scriptural type found him a suspicious critic. Undoubtedly, also, the extraordinary circumstances which attended his preaching in the early days, and which he attributed partly to natural causes, partly to the work of God, and partly to Satanic agency, contributed largely to shape his peculiar attitude to the marvellous.

Most of Wesley's reading was done on his journeys; he rode his horse book in hand, and the amount of close reading he got through in this way is astounding. The man never had an idle moment from five in the morning till ten at night. A perusal of his criticisms on the books he read bears out what has been said as to the natural bent of his mind. He was somewhat a severe critic, with a keen eye for fallacies and a contempt for fripperies of style, but he shared broadly the general taste of his time. He was astonished to find Home's *Douglas* one of the finest tragedies he ever read; he praises Thomson's *Edward and Eleanora* in characteristic eighteenth century terminology—'the sentiments are just and noble, the diction strong, smooth, and elegant;' and he always had a weakness for Prior. (Johnson: 'Prior, sir Prior is a lady's book;,' one wonders whether Wesley justified this sentiment.) As an excellent example of his severer manner, take his remarks on the *Sentimental Journey*, in purely literary form one of the most charming books ever written:

'Sentimental! What is that? It is not English: he might as well say continental.¹ It is not sense; it conveys no determinate idea; yet one fool makes many. And this nonsensical word (who would believe it?) is become a fashionable one! However, the book agrees full well with the title; for one is as queer as the other. For oddity, uncouthness, and unlikeness to all the world beside, I suppose the writer is without a rival.'

¹ We say both now. Curiously, in Walker's *Dictionary* of 1822, thirty years after Wesley's death, 'continental' is included, but not 'sentimental.'

Nothing is said here of any questionable moral tendency in the *Journey*, probably because Wesley seems to have read one volume only as a sample, possibly because the point did not strike him. In Brooke's *Fool of Quality*, which Wesley abridged and republished, there are situations in the revised form quite as risky as the incident of the *fille de chambre*, though it is true that Brooke narrates them with a frown, and Sterne with a leer. The *History of Henry, Earl of Moreland*, which is Wesley's new name for Brooke's novel, is moral, but far from squeamish; and there could probably be no better evidence for the great change of public taste between the middle of the eighteenth century and the middle of the nineteenth. Since that time we have changed again.

When Wesley, however, was satisfied that the moral tone of a book was bad, no literary excellence would induce him to moderate his castigation.

'I borrowed here [Oxford in 1775] a volume of Lord Chesterfield's *Letters*, which I had heard very highly commended. And what did I learn? That he was a man of much wit, middling sense, and some learning; but as absolutely devoid of virtue as any Jew, Turk, or heathen that ever lived. I say, not only void of all religion (for I doubt whether he believed there is a God; though he tags most of his letters with the name, for better sound sake), but even of virtue, of justice, and mercy, which he never once recommended to his son. And truth he sets at open defiance; he continually guards him against it; half his letters inculcate deep dissimulation as the most necessary of all accomplishments. Add to this, his studiously instilling into the young man all the principles of debauchery, when himself was between seventy and eighty years old.'

In this little homily Wesley seems to be enlarging on the famous text, 'the morals of a harlot and the manners of a dancing-master.'

A whole article, and one of great interest, might be written on the relations between the two men, Johnson and Wesley: one or two points of resemblance between them have already been hinted, but another may be mentioned, which, so far as the writer is aware, has not hitherto been noticed. Wesley shared Johnson's contempt for the country and country life. 'The full tide of human existence flows at Charing Cross,' is an epigram that might have come from Wesley with equal propriety. Let the following curious note bear witness. While travelling in Kent in 1766, he writes in his Journal:

'In the little journeys which I have lately taken, I have thought much on the great encomiums which have been for many ages

bestowed on a country life. How have all the learned world cried out,

"O fortunati nimium, bona si sua norait,
Agricolae!"

But, after all, what a flat contradiction is this to universal experience! See that little house under the wood by the river side. There is rural life in perfection. How happy, then, is the farmer that lives there! Let us take a detail of his happiness. He rises with or before the sun, calls his servants, looks to his swine and cows, then to his stable and barns. He sees to the ploughing and sowing his ground, in winter or in spring. In summer and autumn he hurries and sweats among his mowers and reapers. And where is his happiness in the mean time? Which of these employments do we envy? Or do we envy the delicate repast that succeeds, which the poet so languishes for?

"O quando faba, Pythagorae cognata, simulque
Uncta satis pingui ponentur oluscula lardo!"

O the happiness of eating *beans well greased with fat bacon*! Nay, and *cabbage* too! Was Horace in his senses when he talked thus? Or the servile herd of his imitators? Our eyes and ears may convince us there is not a less happy body of men in all England than the country farmers. In general, their life is supremely dull, and it is usually unhappy too. For of all people in the kingdom they are the most discontented; seldom satisfied either with God or man.

This is a strange and interesting outburst. Wesley both preached and practised great plainness of living; as a guest at the tables of his poorer adherents he ate such things as were set before him with relish and thankfulness. More surprising still is the thoroughly secular tone of the whole passage. When Wesley comes to be edited on the principles of the higher criticism this passage will infallibly be branded as a late insertion: (1) as contradictory to passages admittedly genuine; (2) as unmistakeably un-Wesleyan in spirit.

Wesley did Johnson the honour to reproduce in his *Calm Address to the American Colonies* the pith of Johnson's *Taxation no Tyranny*, and that without the slightest public acknowledgement until charged with the conveyance. As there was considerable acquaintance, not to say friendship, between the two, there may have been a private understanding, as we believe Dr. Rigg has pointed out. But the incident illustrates another feature of Wesley's character, that he was as indifferent to literary fame as to pecuniary rewards. It was nothing to him who got the credit of a work; the great and only thing was its moral value. Further,

he ex-
share
other
suitab
unpir
Confo
he hin
in the
treati
to 24-
me, w
this th
princi
Jo
publis
forgot
will n
tions
Johns
nothin
bitter
the r
affect
thus
puttin
great
appro
Natu
Presb
himse
hats
they
of Je
be b
beyon
Sacr
After
ment
Engl
the c
the V
Nort
once
lish c
and

he expected that other people, as reasonable beings, would share his views. He had no scruple whatever in pressing other men's labours into his service if only he thought them suitable: he was the precursor of the literary pirate, though, unpiratelike, he did not line his pockets with the spoils. Conformably, he had no objection to others annexing what he himself had written: *tulit alter honores* did not move him in the least. Early in 1769 he abridged Dr. Watts's 'pretty treatise on the Passions,' cutting it down from 127 pages to 24. 'Why do persons, who treat the same subjects with me, write so much larger books? Of many reasons is not this the chief? We do not write with the same view: their *principal end* is, To get money. My *only one*, To do good.'

Johnson's *Journey to the Western Islands of Scotland* was published in 1775. Wesley read it in 1776, apparently forgot it, and read it again in 1781. His remarks upon it will make a suitable introduction to some of his own observations on Scottish life and customs. He had heard that Johnson was severe upon the whole nation, but could find nothing of it. 'He simply mentions (but without any bitterness) what he approved or disapproved: and many of the reflections are extremely judicious, some of them very affecting.' The suspicion can scarcely be resisted that in thus justifying Johnson, Wesley was also half-unconsciously putting in a word for himself. He likewise mentions with great and characteristic plainness what he approves or disapproves, and for the most part the latter predominates. Naturally as an English Churchman he was displeased with Presbyterian usages in public worship; he could not reconcile himself to men sitting to pray and singing psalms with their hats on. His remarks on Scottish funerals are very scathing; they remind him, he says, of nothing so much as of the words of Jeremiah concerning the burial of Jehoiakim, 'He shall be buried with the burial of an ass, drawn and cast forth beyond the gates of Jerusalem.' The fast day before the Sacrament is ridiculously so called, for they do not fast at all. After a long description of the administration of the Sacrament, he pronounces that the service of the Church of England is much more simple as well as more solemn. On the other hand, he speaks of the great willingness to hear the Word of God, and of the difference between South and North Britain in this respect. But this praise, more than once repeated, he greatly qualifies when he says that English congregations judge themselves rather than the preacher, and their aim is, not only to know but to love and obey.

A valuable passage on the Universities of Scotland may be quoted as it stands. At St. Andrews in May 1776 he writes :

'Two colleges remain. One of them has a tolerable square, but all the windows are broken, like those of a brothel. We were informed the students do this before they leave the college. Where are their blessed¹ governors in the mean time? Are they all fast asleep? The other college is a mean building, but has a handsome library newly erected. In the two colleges, we learned, were about seventy students, nearly the same number as at Old Aberdeen: those at New Aberdeen are not more numerous, neither are those at Glasgow. In Edinburgh, I suppose, there are a hundred: so four universities contain three hundred and ten students: these all come to their several colleges in November, and return home in May; so they *may* study five months in the year, and lounge all the rest. Oh! where was the common sense of those who instituted such colleges? In the English colleges, every one *may* reside all the year, as all my pupils did: and I should have thought myself little better than a highwayman if I had not lectured them every day in the year but Sundays.'

It seems pretty plain that Wesley was ignorant of the fact that many Scottish students, far from lounging the rest of the year, laboured to provide the means for their education; but, of course, what he says is true enough in the case of the well-to-do, and his testimony to a common practice at Oxford in his day is important. We had suspected before that the poorer members of the English Universities seldom came down from entrance to the time of their degree, but this seems explicit evidence of it.

A remarkable piece of information on the style of living in Scotland is given during his Scotch journey of 1788. When he first visited Scotland, even at a nobleman's table, there was only flesh meat of one kind, and no vegetables at all. In 1788 vegetables were as plentiful as in England; he says nothing of greater variety of meats.

It is said in the biographies that Wesley was a man by nature irritable; there are few traces of it in the Journal, but abundant examples of a biting sarcasm. He was never weary, for example, of gibing at the wealthier classes, not always without provocation. Again and again he notes of a congregation that all behaved well except a few 'so-called' gentlefolk. Occasionally his animadversions are exceedingly severe. A specimen or two of the more genial kind may be read with pleasure. At St. Ives once 'two or three pretty

¹ The reader's attention is called to this word. It is an amusing and probably unique, instance of an expletive in Wesley.

butter
but all
the ut
tunity
whole
situati
below
rously
on the
it, in t
Jacob
hat.'
establi
ments
marrie
includ
last m
suppli
draper
their m
the pre
cally n
being
tenanc
but the
million

A
itinerar
'Be
Wickam
words,
The pe
from fa
with the

Wi
brough
rately
have b
hoped,
a work
would
the fou
Play;
bed o
that th

butterflies came, and looked, and smiled, and went away ; but all the rest of the numerous congregation behaved with the utmost seriousness.' At Durham, Wesley took the opportunity to go over the Castle, with which he was upon the whole disappointed, in spite of its fine and commanding situation. In particular the furniture and appointments fell below his expectation. Speaking of the tapestry as ludicrously out of character, he says, 'In Jacob's vision you see, on the one side, a little paltry ladder, and an angel climbing it, in the attitude of a chimney-sweeper ; on the other side, Jacob staring at him, from under a large silver-laced hat.' Again, at Fulneck he was shown the recently established Moravian settlement, the chapel, hall, apartments of the widows, single men, single women, the married couples' quarters, and all the other buildings, including the various workshops for different trades. These last made a great impression on him. He learnt that they supplied the adjoining neighbourhood with bread, groceries drapery, hardware, and other such things ; that they bought their materials with ready money, and had a quick sale for the products, and made no bad debts ; that they had practically no wages bill, more than two hundred and fifty inmates being continually employed for little more than a bare maintenance. And what, pray, is his comment ? 'I see not what but the mighty power of God can hinder them from acquiring millions.'

A last specimen is taken from the early days of his itinerancy :

'Between twelve and one I preached in a convenient ground at Wickam, two or three miles from Newcastle. I spoke strong, rough words, but I did not perceive that any regarded what was spoken. The people indeed were exceeding quiet, and the cold kept them from falling asleep ; until (before two) I left them, very well satisfied with the preacher and with themselves.'

With great reluctance this inadequate notice must be brought to a close. Many tempting topics have been deliberately disregarded, and those that have been touched upon have been only meagrely presented, though sufficiently, it is hoped, to whet the reader's curiosity. The *Journal* is indeed a work which surprises by the variety of its allusions. Who would expect an anecdote of Garrick in the grave pages of the founder of Methodism ; or a criticism of the Westminster Play ; or even a seemingly authentic tradition of the death-bed of Charles II. ? Perhaps some may be disappointed that the *Journal* does not describe more fully the social and

domestic life of the time. Yet to a man who can read between the lines and catch the meaning of a passing reference, the book is abundantly rich in this respect also. You cannot read beyond a page or two before you come across a sentence which lights up the mind with a flash-light picture of old-world life: we go with Wesley into a fashionable church, and watch the company salute one another in the very manner which Steele reproves; we ride under the archway into the inn-yard, and are not in the least astonished to see Mr. Abraham Adams smoking his pipe in the gallery.

There are indications of a renewal of interest in Wesley, his life, his work, and his teaching. He has in truth been strangely neglected except by a chosen few. There are signs also that the Journal is about to be 'boomed.' We may at least express the hope that John Wesley, that man of plain speech and plain dealing, may be spared the pain of extravagant and hysterical adulation. It has been recently said that 'there is no book in all the world like John Wesley's Journal. It is pre-eminently the book of the resurrection life lived in this world. It has very few companions. Indeed, it stands out solitary in all Christian literature, clear, detached, columnar.' There is certainly a note of 'enthusiasm' in this, and yet a careful reader of the Journal will admit that in the main it is just. Very true, there is no book like Wesley's Journal, because there is no man exactly like Wesley; and the greatness of the book is that it lets us see so transparently what he was as a man. The human and secular interest on which we have enlarged is as important for showing this as the more spiritual, ecclesiastical, or controversial side. Others may be led hereafter to touch on that; for the present we have confined ourselves to what is lighter.

1. *The*
D
C
2. *The*
H
D
B
3. *My*
R
th
4. *The*
(I

ARCH.
within
genera
questio
supple
eviden
learnin
literatu
spread
The co
have b
propos
consider
has bee
lation
tions;
concern
the spl

It i
discove
earlier
civiliza
at Ko
Nimron
initiate
(outsid
literatu

¹ Au
see Chu

ART. V.—THE MYCENÆAN AGE.

1. *The Early Age of Greece.* By WILLIAM RIDGEWAY, M.A., Disney Professor of Archæology in the University of Cambridge. Vol. I. (Cambridge, 1901.)
2. *The Oldest Civilization of Greece: Studies in Mycenæan History.* By H. R. H. HALL, M.A., Assistant in the Department of Egyptian and Assyrian Antiquities, British Museum. (London, 1901.)
3. *Mycenæan Tree and Pillar Cult and its Mediterranean Relations.* By ARTHUR J. EVANS, Litt.D., Keeper of the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford. (London, 1901.)
4. *The Annual of the British School at Athens.* Nos. II.–VI. (London, 1897–1901.)

ARCHÆOLOGY has amply vindicated its claim, asserted only within the past century, and especially within the present generation, to be the sister Muse to History. It is no longer a question of pitting potsherds against Thucydides, or of merely supplementing the literary record here and there by the evidence of an inscription. We have learned, and are daily learning still, that there are whole periods of history of which literature has but the vaguest tale to tell, but which archæology spreads out before us with an ample display of concrete facts. The comparative claims of archæology and literary history have been ably set forth in a recent volume,¹ and we do not propose to deal with them here. Our present object is to consider one special sphere in which archæological discovery has been active, and in respect to which archæological speculation has recently taken shape in several noteworthy publications; and it is a sphere which, next to that of religion, concerns us perhaps more deeply than any other, since it is the sphere of the civilization and history of Greece.

It is just thirty years since the era of great archæological discoveries on Greek soil began; but elsewhere they are of earlier date. The triumphs of the spade in rescuing lost civilizations from oblivion begin with Botta's excavations at Kouyunjik and Khorsabad in 1842, and Layard's at Nimroud three years later; and to the explorations thus initiated we owe practically all our authentic knowledge (outside the Old Testament and the scanty notices in Greek literature) of Assyrian and Babylonian history, ranging back

¹ *Authority and Archæology*, edited by D. G. Hogarth (London, 1899); see *Church Quarterly Review*, xlix. 167–90.

into the neighbourhood of 4500 B.C. Egyptian history, with its pyramids still standing conspicuous above the sands, and with the assistance of Manetho, has always stretched far back into the mists of antiquity ; but within the last few years its range has been unexpectedly extended by the discoveries of Petrie and others, until Menes, the supposed 'legendary' founder of the first dynasty of Egyptian rulers, is now found to be a historical personage with a past behind him. In Greece, and in Europe generally, we cannot ascend (apart from geological evidence) to any such hoary age ; but archæology, besides revealing to us the monuments of the Mausoleum and Pergamum, Olympia and Delphi, has added some thousand years of authentic, though still very fragmentary, history to our knowledge of the race to which, beyond all others, our intellectual and artistic civilization is due.

One need not own to very advanced years in order to have learnt Greek history at a time when that history began—as Grote makes it begin—with the first Olympiad, in 776 B.C., all behind that epoch being myth, which the youthful mind might or might not accept as solid fact. Yet at that very time the age of archæology was beginning, and the spade of the explorer was laying the foundations of an edifice which we have since seen rising before our eyes, until it now begins to take definite form and shape. A whole civilization has been revealed, which came into being, culminated in great richness and magnificence, and fell into decay before that date which formerly was regarded as marking the beginning of authentic Greek history. For the last thirty years the evidences of this civilization have been accumulating ; and, although there is every reason to think that the years to come will add greatly to these evidences, it is already possible to formulate provisional theories which serve to classify and solidify our existing knowledge, and so to pave the way to further advances.

It is curious that the first great discoveries in the sphere of prehistoric Greek archæology were made by one who was no trained scholar or professed archæologist, but an enthusiast on the subject of Greek literature, with a burning faith in his own ideas, and with money to enable him to put those ideas to the test. When faith in the historical basis of the *Iliad* was dim, and when the site of the historic Ilium was commonly supposed to lie elsewhere, Heinrich Schliemann, a Mecklenburger whose energy had made him a successful banker at St. Petersburg and Moscow, first set spade to the hill of Hissarlik, and so embarked on that career of discovery

whic
the
been

det
have
sum
wha
first
187
mad
as i
cove
Tro
men
was
site
citi
from
fire)
Hon
cont
and
exis

187
tion
thro
Lion
of st
shaf
ten
one
were
face
ring
of
quan
town
diffe
'bee

1
Schl
E. S
draw

ory, with
nds, and
far back
years its
veries of
endary'
w found
him. In
d (apart
ge; but
s of the
as added
ragmen-
beyond
due.

order to
began—
776 B.C.,
ful mind
that very
spade of
ce which
w begins
tion has
in great
ore that
eginning
ears the
ng; and,
to come
ossible to
sify and
e way to

the sphere
who was
nthusiast
th in his
ose ideas
the *Iliad*
was com-
mann, a
successful
de to the
discovery

which has secured him a permanent and honourable place as the founder of all our knowledge of what, since his time, has been generally designated 'the Mycenæan age.'

It is not possible, within our present limits, to describe in detail all the discoveries of 'Mycenæan' antiquities which have been made during the last thirty years; but a brief summary of the more notable among them will serve to show what the material is with which we have to deal.¹ Schliemann's first excavation on the site of Troy was begun in October 1871, but it was not until 1873 that his first great 'find' was made, consisting of the huge brick wall of the 'second city,' as it is now called, and the magnificent gold treasure discovered close to it. The total result of Schliemann's work at Troy, continued at intervals over many years, and supplemented by that of Dörpfeld, was to show, first, that Hissarlik was undoubtedly the true site of Troy; secondly, that that site had been successively occupied by no less than nine cities, of which the second (also known as the 'burnt' city, from the signs which showed that it had been destroyed by fire), and the sixth (which Dörpfeld regards as the Troy of Homer) were the most important; and, thirdly, that these cities contained relics of a culture then unexemplified elsewhere, and of an artistic excellence which no one suspected of existing at an age so far remote.

At Mycenæ, to which Schliemann turned his attention in 1874, and again in 1876, his results were even more sensational. In the upper city, girt with massive Cyclopean walls, through which the principal entrance is by the celebrated Lion Gate, he found a group of graves, surrounded by a ring of stone slabs set edgeways in the ground. The graves were shafts cut vertically down into the rock to a depth of from ten to sixteen feet. The bodies in them, which varied from one to five in number, had been buried, not burnt, and they were surrounded by a mass of ornaments, including gold face-masks, diadems, pendants, armlets, belts, buttons, pins, rings, cups, and quantities of other objects, with silver vases of various kinds, weapons and utensils of bronze, and quantities of pottery, terra cotta, and ivory. In the lower town also tombs were found, but these were of a quite different kind. They are buildings of the type known as 'beehive' tombs, consisting of large vaulted chambers (about

¹ By far the best account of Schliemann's discoveries is contained in *Schliemann's Excavations*, by C. Schuchhardt (English translation by E. Sellers, London, 1891), which is profusely illustrated with plans and drawings of the objects found.

fifty feet in height and diameter), built in the hillside and approached by a long passage. Eight of these structures were found, and at first were believed to be treasuries, that having been the name assigned to them in antiquity; but the discovery of similar buildings elsewhere, which had not been plundered, conclusively established their sepulchral character. A large number of less pretentious rock-hewn tombs were also found in the lower town, which yielded great quantities of pottery, bronze articles, gems, and two rings of iron, the only example of this metal in ancient Mycenæ. In addition the ground plan of the palace in the citadel was more or less perfectly made out.

Yet a third town of prehistoric Greece was attacked by the indefatigable Schliemann, with admirable results. This was Tiryns, situated on a low rock rising out of the Argolic plain, about eight miles from Mycenæ. Here he excavated in 1884, laying bare the whole of the ancient palace, while Dr. Dörpfeld in the following year traced out the great circuit wall of the citadel. Tiryns, as one of the lately recovered odes of Bacchylides has reminded us, was said to have been built by the Cyclopes, and its eminence was purely of prehistoric date, being superseded by Mycenæ, as both were subsequently superseded, and ultimately destroyed, by Argos. Its remains bear out this tradition. The walls are built of colossal blocks of rough-hewn stone (some ten feet long), and have a depth of about twenty-five feet, ranging up in one part to nearly sixty feet. In the thickest parts of the wall chambers were pierced, opening out of a transverse gallery. A somewhat similar arrangement has since been found at Knossos in Crete. The ground plan of the palace buildings was laid bare, and has provided invaluable material for the discussion of the arrangement of the Homeric house. Portions of decorative friezes, in alabaster and blue glass paste (the *κύανος* of Homer's palace of Alcinous) were found, together with fragments of wall paintings. The small objects found at Tiryns are not to compare with those of Mycenæ or Troy, and consist mainly of pottery and terra cotta.

These were the three great achievements of Schliemann, and his work elsewhere (as at Orchomenus, where he excavated another large beehive tomb with a beautiful ceiling, and at Ithaca, where his results were not conclusive) must be passed over in silence. What he had done was to reveal a whole new period of civilization, which was of additional interest because it could apparently be brought into direct connexion with the Homeric poems. About this identifica-

tion
whic
disco
Troy
burn
treas
grav
Agar
Paus
bodie
very
ident
were
some
altog
much
done
T
inter
to th
tomb
Argo
wher
addit
gems
d'au
plain
rema
1893
Hera
many
late
Muse
other
furth
of Bi
pated
thoug
sensat
weapo
of M
of th
and o
the bo
rude

tion Schliemann himself had no doubts. It was the *Iliad* which had led him to excavate at Troy and Mycenæ, and his discoveries were at once labelled with Homeric names. At Troy he had no hesitation in calling the great gate of the burnt city by the name of the Scæan Gate, and the gold treasure was the treasure of Priam. At Mycenæ the shaft graves in the citadel were identified with the graves of Agamemnon and those who were slain with him, which Pausanias states to have been shown there in his time. The bodies found in them were therefore to be regarded as the very bones of Agamemnon, Cassandra, and the rest. Such identifications, resting upon enthusiasm rather than evidence, were looked at askance by archaeologists, and perhaps caused some of them to minimise the importance of the discoveries altogether. But they appealed to the popular fancy, and did much to call general attention to the work which had been done, and to stimulate interest in it for the future.

The game was now afoot, and discoveries, of minor interest individually, but collectively adding much material to the general stock, followed one another quickly. Beehive tombs were found at Menidi in Attica, at the Heræum near Argos, at Vaphio in Laconia, at Volo in Thessaly, and elsewhere. The Vaphio tomb (excavated in 1889) yielded, in addition to pottery, bronze weapons, beads, and engraved gems, the two magnificent gold cups which are the *chefs-d'œuvre* of Mycenæan art. At Goulas or Gla, in the Copaic plain of Bœotia, formerly an island in the Copaic lake, the remains of a great Cyclopean fortress were excavated in 1893. Mycenæan remains have also been found at the Heræum of Argos, at Nauplia, at Thoricus, Eleusis, and many other places in Attica, while a beautiful treasure of the late Mycenæan period from Ægina is now in the British Museum. Smaller finds have also been made in several other parts of Continental Greece. The Ægean islands add further evidence of an important character. The excavations of Biliotti at Ialysus in Rhodes (in 1868-1871) even anticipated Schliemann in the discovery of Mycenæan objects, though naturally they did not at the time create the same sensation. The proceeds consisted of gold ornaments, bronze weapons, engraved gems, and pottery; and by the generosity of Mr. Ruskin they are now in the British Museum. Many of the other islands—Amorgos, Naxos, Antiparos, Thera, and others—contain graves of the primitive type, in which the bodies must have been laid in contracted postures, with rude pottery, stone vessels, bronze weapons, and occasionally

silver vessels, all of an early character, but clearly connected with the Mycenæan civilization. At Thera some of these objects were discovered beneath the lava of a volcanic eruption; and attempts to date this eruption on geological grounds have played a part in the controversy about the date of the Mycenæan age as a whole.

At Melos still more important results have been obtained. At Phylákopi, on the north-east coast of the island, a site was attacked by Mr. Cecil Smith, director of the British School at Athens, in 1896 and 1897, and by his successor, Mr. D. G. Hogarth, in 1898 and 1899. The two last years' work showed that the site was unexpectedly important.¹ Phylákopi was the ancient capital of Melos, owing its importance to the great quarries of obsidian, which in the stone age was the material in most request for all cutting implements. No other island in the Ægean or Levant possesses these volcanic deposits; hence there must have been in prehistoric times an active export trade from Phylákopi. When, however, obsidian was superseded by bronze Phylákopi lost its importance, and no doubt decayed rapidly. These considerations account for the phenomena displayed by the site. Four distinct settlements are revealed by the spade, of which the latest alone is contemporary with the true Mycenæan period. The earliest settlement was represented solely by earthenware vessels, no traces of habitations being discoverable. Above these deposits come extensive wall remains, but with no signs of fortification. The pottery of this settlement shows an advance from the simple incised ware of its predecessor to geometric patterns, sometimes in fine incised work and sometimes painted. Many of the potsherds were marked with signs such as Mr. A. J. Evans had already noticed upon seals from the Ægean, and of which he has since found great quantities in Crete. The third settlement was surrounded by a strong fortification wall, and the houses show a great advance alike in structure and ornamentation. The walls were covered with stucco, upon which were painted designs, sometimes decorative patterns, sometimes representations of plants, animals, and men. One such fresco showed groups of brilliant flying fish, another a bather or fisherman. The pottery (except in very rough specimens) is painted, not incised, and the patterns become more complex, finally breaking out into naturalistic designs of plants and animals, similar to those found in the frescoes. This was plainly the great era of the prosperity of Phylákopi. The fourth and

¹ See the *Annual of the British School at Athens*, Nos. ii.-iv.

last
char
built
have
ment
evid
been
ware
instar
depic
fish.
ware
stage
portar
also b
in 18
the gr
age, h
bronze

TH
eviden
of civi
that si
cence
likely
of the
work
when
discov
no nev
the gr
Minos,
where
their o
tion ha
site, bu
frustrat
had be
of the
abandon

It is
the vict
ago as
and ha
the her
VOL.

last settlement, which follows it, is of definitely Mycenæan character, but the houses and fortifications are less strongly built, and comparatively few remains of mural decoration have been found. On the other hand, a quantity of fragments of Mycenæan pottery came to light, which from the evidence of their material and fabric can be shown to have been imported, not manufactured in Melos itself. The native wares of the third city still continue, however, and in one instance a remarkable vase was discovered, on which is depicted a procession of men, each carrying in either hand a fish. This was the most notable trophy of pre-Mycenæan ware produced by the excavations, and it belongs to its latest stage, just before the native work was superseded by the importations of Mycenæan pottery. To the Mycenæan period also belongs the palace, the remains of which were uncovered in 1899, with other houses, which add to our knowledge of the ground plans of Mycenæan dwellings. The Mycenæan age, however, was the age of bronze; and with the victory of bronze the glory departed from Phylákopi.

The importance of the Melian explorations lay in the evidence which they afforded of the continuous development of civilization on a single site, previous to and culminating in that stage which had already been displayed in its magnificence on the sites excavated by Schliemann. It seemed likely that Phylákopi would occupy the attention of students of the prehistoric period for some time to come; yet the work of the British School there had hardly been completed when its brilliance was outshone by a series of sensational discoveries in another portion of the Ægean basin. It was no new thing for the eyes of archæologists to be fixed upon the great island of Crete, the legendary home of Zeus and Minos, where a hundred cities flourished in Homeric days, where the ancient race of Eteocretans continued and retained their own language into historic times. Even cursory inspection had shown the existence of more than one promising site, but external and political conditions had combined to frustrate all schemes of digging. Dr. Schliemann himself had been anxious to excavate at Knossos, but the demands of the local landowners were so extravagant that he had to abandon his designs.

It is to the energy and insight of Mr. Arthur Evans that the victory over these untoward conditions is due. So long ago as 1894 he had set his eye upon the site of Knossos, and had resolved to obtain the power of excavating there by the heroic process of buying up the land himself. To the

'almost inexhaustible powers of obstruction' of the Mahometan proprietors Mr. Evans pays the highest tribute; but his own perseverance was yet more inexhaustible, and by the beginning of 1900, aided by the results of the insurrection and the intervention of that cumbrous *deus ex machina* the European Concert, the whole site was in his hands, and, aided by the wholly inadequate support of the British public, he was able to begin digging.

The results of his first season's work were dramatically successful. He did not, indeed, make any such find of golden treasures as Schliemann at Troy and Mycenæ; nevertheless he established the right of Knossos to rank with the most important sites of the Mycenæan age yet known to us. About half of the great palace of Knossos (reputed the palace of Minos) was uncovered. Its ground plan was revealed, showing an extraordinary complex of rooms and galleries; a reception room, with a carved stone throne, was discovered, and a row of narrow store chambers, opening out of a long corridor, recalled the similar arrangement in the great walls of Tiryns. Some of the chambers still contained huge earthenware jars, many of them in perfect preservation. In addition, at various places deposits of inscribed clay tablets were discovered, bearing writing of the same type as that which Mr. Evans had already discovered on Cretan seals. To be accurate, two types of writing were found. On more than 900 tablets¹ the writing is of a linear description, with characters which presumably stand for syllables, though their language and meaning are still unknown. Mr. Evans, however, shows good reasons for believing that in many cases they embody accounts relating to the palace stores. One deposit stands out by itself as containing writing of a hieroglyphic type. This might be expected to be of earlier date than the linear script; but Mr. Evans states that these tablets were found in one of the latest parts of the palace. Mr. Evans regards this hieroglyphic writing as descended from the primitive 'pictographic' script found by him on certain seals, and perhaps as peculiar to the Eteocretan branch of the population. An authoritative explanation is, however, as yet impossible.

But more interesting, perhaps, even than these evidences of primitive writing are the artistic results of the excavations at Knossos. The walls of the palace were normally covered

¹ These figures relate only to the first season's work. Further deposits of tablets were found last spring, including one tablet with twenty-four lines of inscription.

wit
fres
of
dece
us v
in M
cust
repr
figur
real
'reg
hair
reser
the
seaso
relief
mod
of m
and
repr
in th
in sty
period
foreign
ladies
tion.
except
war a
fine
Mycen
the V
many
in wh
part i
remind
been
influe
differ
indep
O
to say
The c
of sto
wood

with plaster, and on the plaster were executed elaborate frescoes, of which considerable portions have survived. Many of these frescoes contain figure subjects, accompanied by decorative patterns and designs; and these not only provide us with the means of estimating the state of artistic culture in Mycenæan Crete, but also give us pictures of the life and customs of the people. One corridor was decorated with the representation of a procession; elsewhere was a well preserved figure of a youth, which, as Mr. Evans says, affords 'the first real portraiture of a Mycenæan man.'¹ The features are 'regular, almost classical,' and 'the dark eyes and black curly hair and high brachycephalic skull present close points of resemblance to certain types still to be found, especially in the highlands of central and western Crete.' The second season's work produced several fragments of painted stucco reliefs of human beings, elaborately and naturalistically modelled. Another part of the palace contained a quantity of miniature designs of a wholly new type, showing groups and crowds of persons in fine outline drawing. They are represented as gathered in courts or gardens, with buildings in the background, and 'are incomparably more modern' in style than those found on Athenian vases of the classical period, 'and display a vivacity and a fashionable pose quite foreign to classical art.' One fresco represents a crowd of ladies in low-necked dresses, engaged in animated conversation. The men are black-haired, clean shaven, and naked except for a loin cloth and buskins; in some places scenes of war are depicted. Animals are also represented, notably in a fine painted plaster relief of a bull, an animal to which Mycenæan artists were very partial, as is shown notably by the Vaphio cups and the fresco at Tiryns, to say nothing of many gems. Bull-hunting is the subject of several paintings, in which women as well as men are represented as taking part in the sport. In all this fresco work there is much that reminds one of the Egyptian wall paintings which have long been familiar, and which no doubt exercised considerable influence on Mycenæan art; nevertheless there are sufficient differences to establish a genuine claim to originality and independence on the part of the Ægean artists.

Of the architecture of the palace of Knossos it must suffice to say that the materials used are gypsum and limestone. The columns must have been of wood, only the bases being of stone; and the walls were mainly of clay, supported by wooden beams and covered with plaster. It is this free use

¹ *Annual of the British School at Athens*, vi. 15.

of wood which especially differentiates Mycenaean architecture from that of the classical and post-classical periods in the examples known to us. The second season's work (in 1901) revealed a large staircase, flanked by columns, descending with two turns to a group of halls on a lower level, with which we have nothing elsewhere in Greek architecture to compare.¹ Full details of this, however, have not yet been published.

One feature of the Knossian discoveries has been made the subject of a special study by Mr. Evans—namely, the evidence which they afford as to the religious practices of the Mycenaean age.² He has here collected a number of representations on gems, or vases, or frescoes, of tree worship or pillar worship, two closely allied phases of religious ceremonial. Notably, in two chambers of the palace of Knossos are square pillars, standing in the middle of the room, on which are carved, on four sides in one case and three in the other, representations of a double axe.³ This form of axe recurs repeatedly in what appear to be religious connexions. Quantities of miniature axes were found by Mr. Hogarth among the votive offerings in the Dictæan cave. Now the Carian name for this double axe was *labrys*, a name which recurs in that of the town Labranda, the chief seat of the worship of the Carian Zeus, and also in the word Labyrinth, which is so closely associated with the legends of Knossos. Consequently Mr. Evans interprets the name Labyrinth as 'the House of the Double Axe'; and in the palace of Knossos, with its tortuous complex of chambers and corridors, and its walls marked with scores of representations of the double axe, he sees the origin of the legend of the famous Labyrinth of Crete. The worship of sacred pillars, as well as of sacred trees, is, of course, well known in Semitic lands, in the 'pillars' and 'groves' of the Old Testament, while stones, especially meteorites, have been the objects of worship in many lands; and Mr. Evans collects a mass of instances and illustrations in support of his theory, which at any rate holds

¹ *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, xxi. 334, art. by R. C. Bosanquet on 'Archæology in Greece, 1900-1901.'

² *Mycenaean Tree and Pillar Cult and its Mediterranean Relations*; reprinted as an independent volume from the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, xxi. 99 *sqq.*

³ Similar pillars were also found at Phylákopi, as well as in houses at Knossos, outside the palace; see Hogarth, *Annual of the British School at Athens*, vi. 76, 77, whose remarks go far to invalidate the suggestion of Mr. Rouse (*Journal of Hellenic Studies*, xxi. 272) that the pillars were merely structural supports for the roof.

the field until fuller evidence comes to light. Here we have, unfortunately, no space to examine at greater length his elaborate and ingenious paper.

Knossos is not the only site in Crete to which the energy of explorers has been directed. While Mr. Evans was at work at the palace of Minos Mr. Hogarth made a thorough exploration of the celebrated Dictæan cave, the legendary birthplace of Zeus, finding therein hundreds of votive offerings in bronze, stone, pottery, and occasionally iron and gold, many of them embedded in the stalactite pillars and crevices of the cave. Mr. Hogarth has since excavated at Zakro (where he found considerable Mycenæan remains), and Mr. Bosanquet at Præsos, while the Italians are uncovering at Phæstos a palace second only in importance to that of Knossos. But it is time to pass from the details of explorations to the consideration of the questions which these explorations suggest. We have here, revealed by the researches of the last thirty years, a pre-classical civilization, rich in precious and artistic objects, extending over the islands of the Ægean and the neighbouring lands of Greece and Asia Minor, and eastwards as far as Cyprus, where recent excavations on behalf of the British Museum have yielded a quantity of examples of Mycenæan art in its latest stages. Who were the people who produced this civilization? What was their name? What was their race? When did they flourish? And, as a subsidiary but very interesting question, what is their relation to the civilization represented in the Homeric poems?

It is in answer to these questions that the two books which are named at the head of this article have been written—written, it is true, while fresh discoveries are still pressing in on us, but not inopportunately for the student who wishes to be able to appraise the value of these discoveries as they appear. Though dealing with the same subject-matter there are considerable differences in their scope and style. Mr. Hall's is a clear and intelligent summary of the extant remains of the Mycenæan age, and an examination of the principal theories which have been advanced in explanation of them. His position in the Egyptian and Assyrian Department in the British Museum has accustomed him to deal with first-hand evidence, and gives especial value to his statements with regard to the relations between the Mycenæan civilization and the East. He is not afraid to state his own opinion, and it may perhaps be put down to the credit of the Oxford Historical School that he is able to do so in a clear and readable, if not very elegant, style. He has no special

theories of his own to advocate with regard to the greater questions at issue, but he provides the reader with the means of estimating the theories which others have propounded.

Professor Ridgeway's book, on the other hand, owes nothing of its interest to the graces of exposition. His arguments are produced cumbrously and at great length, and with a disastrous want of discrimination between good arguments and bad. Any indication is treated as a good proof if it points in the way desired; and thus arguments which really have weight are cumbered with a mass of irrelevant, or slightly relevant, details, which end by weakening one's belief in the case as a whole. In literary workmanship, moreover, Professor Ridgeway is sadly to seek. He has no notion of constructing a paragraph. The divisions between them appear to come quite at haphazard, and he has a lamentable fondness for that most irritating of all literary devices, the printing of a number of single sentences as separate paragraphs. We hear, or used to hear, much about the 'unlettered physicist.' It is to be hoped that Professor Ridgeway's book is not to be taken as a fair example of the intellectual culture produced by the study of archæology.

The importance of his work lies in the fact that it embodies a new theory of the Mycenæan age, on which we shall have more to say shortly. But first another matter of some interest may be disposed of. The questions concerning the Mycenæan civilization resolve themselves ultimately into two: What is its date, and who were its founders? On the first of these questions controversy for some time was hot, but a general agreement is now observable on the part of the best authorities, and it may consequently be disposed of briefly. The relative order of the classes of pottery found on Mycenæan sites can be determined, partly by the order in which the successive deposits lie on sites such as Troy and Phylakopi, on which several settlements followed one another, and partly by considerations as to the stages of progress shown in them—the use of bronze or iron, of more or less advanced ornamentation on vases, and the like. Such evidence shows clearly enough that the Mycenæan age lies behind the classical age (it was once suggested that it belonged to the Byzantine period!), but it does not enable us to determine the length of time which separates them. Such positive chronology can only be obtained by establishing connexions with data already known—in this case with the history of Egypt. Objects of Egyptian manufacture have been found on Mycenæan sites, and Mycenæan pottery on Egyptian

sites; and this evidence, though still scanty, has of late become sufficient to allow of fairly certain conclusions. Scarabs and fragments of porcelain, inscribed with the names of Amenhotep III. and his queen, have been found in the palace of Mycenæ and in the cemetery at Ialysus, in Rhodes; and the date of this king is given by Brugsch as about 1500-1466 B.C., by Petrie as 1414-1383 B.C. At Knossos Mr. Evans found, first, an Egyptian statuette assignable to the Twelfth Dynasty (about 2700-2500 B.C.), lying in a pre-Mycenæan stratum of the palace, and, secondly, a lid of a box inscribed with the name of Khyan, one of the Hyksos kings (about 1800 B.C.) Of course these finds only show that the Mycenæan remains among which they lay were not earlier than the dates named; they do not show how much later they may be, though it is not likely, indeed barely conceivable, that objects bearing the name of a Hyksos king were exported from Egypt after the expulsion of this intrusive dynasty. On the other hand vases clearly of Mycenæan type are depicted in wall paintings at Thebes of the fifteenth century B.C., and actual Mycenæan vases have been found at Gurob, a city which only existed from about 1500 to 1250 B.C., and at Tell-el-Amarna, the capital of Amenhotep IV. (about 1383-1365), which was deserted after that heretical sovereign's death. At Kahun Mycenæan pottery was found in a tomb doubtfully assigned to about 1100 B.C. Any of these pieces of evidence (except perhaps that from Tell-el-Amarna) might by itself be regarded as precarious, but their cumulative force, unweakened as it is by any contrary indications, goes far to establish the conclusion that the Mycenæan age proper lay somewhere about 1600-1000 B.C., while the pre-Mycenæan stages found in the islands may range back to 2000 B.C., or earlier. It is only in Cyprus that evidence has come to light which at all supports the contention of those who would bring down the Mycenæan age to about 1000-800 B.C., since here Mycenæan ware is found in connexion with ivories which have clearly been influenced by Assyrian art of about the ninth century, and with Egyptian objects of even later date. But Cyprus lay out of the main current of Greek civilization, and it is evident that Mycenæan influences continued in force here long after they had been superseded in Greece itself and the Ægean basin.

There remains the great question, What people produced the civilization which we call Mycenæan? On this point few archæologists have cared to speak positively. The Greeks themselves of the classical period knew nothing definite of

their own ancient history. They had traditions of various ancient races—Pelasgians, Leleges, Minyans, and others—preceding the Achæans, whom they knew from Homer, and the Dorians, who came in subsequently with 'the return of the Heracleids.' Also they had traditional pedigrees, in which eponymous heroes were invented as progenitors of the existing tribes or races, with a scheme of affinities which seemed suitable to their historical positions. Such evidence, however, is obviously precarious in the extreme, and scholars as a rule have been slow to dogmatize. Here it is that Professor Ridgeway comes upon the stage with a theory which has at least the merit of being clear-cut and precise. It can be stated in a few words. It is to the Pelasgians, a dark-haired, dark-complexioned race, inhabiting the mainland of Greece, the Ægean islands, and the coast of Asia Minor, and spreading even into Italy, that the Mycenæan civilization is due. It is a civilization of the Bronze Age, and is to be sharply distinguished from the civilization of the Homeric poems, which belongs to the Iron Age. The Iron Age was brought into Greece by the Achæans, a fair-haired race whose civilization was substantially identical with that which has been found in the cemeteries of Hallstatt, in the Austrian Alps, and who are themselves to be identified with that Central and North European Celtic race which has more than once, in historical times, descended in invading hordes upon the peninsulas of Southern Europe. For these dominant Achæans the minstrels of the subjugated, but not exterminated, Pelasgian race composed the poems which we now know as the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*.

Such is Professor Ridgeway's theory,¹ which at least has the merit of presenting the issues clearly, and thus of focussing discussion on definite points. To consider it in detail is, of course, impracticable here; but it may be possible to estimate the value of its principal propositions. First with regard to the Pelasgi. Professor Ridgeway is at pains to prove that all the places in which Mycenæan remains have been found are associated, in ancient legend or by plausible deductions from such tradition, with the Pelasgi; and also that Mycenæan remains have come to light in all those places which history or legend especially connects with the Pelasgi. The proof is

¹ The part of it which relates to the Pelasgi was published in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies* in 1896, and has therefore been known to scholars for some years. It is consequently mentioned and discussed in Mr. Hall's book. That which relates to the Achæans, though embodied in a paper read before the Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies in 1898, has not previously been published at length.

a long one (it occupies more than two hundred pages), since the places to be dealt with are many, and the evidence connecting them with the Pelasgi is often elusive and has to be sought with pains and difficulty. The proofs, indeed, are of very unequal value. Professor Ridgeway makes much use of the traditional pedigrees of the Greek families and national heroes, many of which are obviously late concoctions, intended to account for the origin of various tribes. It is impossible to build, for instance, on the statement that Æolus, Xuthus, and Dorus were the sons of Hellen, and that Ion and Achæus were the sons of Xuthus. These are, obviously, merely eponymous heroes, invented as ancestors of the existing tribes. Moreover Professor Ridgeway only uses these genealogies when they suit his purpose. Another, preserved by Dionysius of Halicarnassus, gives Achæus and Pelasgus as brothers, which clearly is irreconcilable with Professor Ridgeway's main theory, and consequently is ignored. Professor Ridgeway also devotes several paragraphs to proving, by modern analogies, that discrepancies in the narratives of an event do not prove that the event itself is unhistorical, and that the evidence of a pedigree is not vitiated by the fact that it includes legendary elements (such as the parentage of gods); but he omits to notice that it matters greatly whether the discrepancies relate to the main point at issue or to its minor details, and that other evidence besides arbitrary assertion must be introduced in order to decide at what point the boundary line between myth and history is crossed in a pedigree. The fact that we believe in the existence of King Alfred does not commit us to a belief in the historical character of Brute the Trojan.

So, too, with the proposition that all places where the population was traditionally Pelasgian possessed Mycenæan remains. The two districts about which this tradition is clearest are Attica and Arcadia. Of these Attica presents no difficulty, since Mycenæan remains have been found there in abundance. But Arcadia is a serious obstacle, since it has hitherto produced barely a single object of Mycenæan work. It is true that it has not yet been systematically explored; and Professor Ridgeway would have done well frankly to admit this and to trust his theory to the proof of time. Instead of this he spends several pages in arguing that the tomb of Æpytus, mentioned in the *Iliad* (ii. 603 sq.) as a famous landmark in Arcadia, was a monument of the same type as the circular burying-place in the acropolis of Mycenæ; that Æpytus was the ancestor of the Iamid family of soothsayers;

that they were a family of great importance; that consequently the traditions connected with the tomb of Æpytus would be carefully preserved; that Æpytus was fourth in descent from Lycaon, son of Pelasgus; that the ancient genealogies can be trusted; and that consequently Arcadia was a great centre of Pelasgian stock—which we knew already explicitly from Pausanias, but which does not advance by one inch the proof that the Pelasgi were the makers of the Mycenæan art. The fact is that Professor Ridgeway's logic is elementary, and his methods those of the advocate, not the scholar. He accumulates indications, or what seem to be such, which tell in his favour, and does not consider the indications which tell against him. This part of his book is a long exposition of argument by the method of agreement, notoriously an untrustworthy implement of logic, but much in vogue among mythologists and folk-lorists, who seem to find no difficulty in adducing long strings of facts in support of any and every theory. From a classical scholar we should have hoped for a stricter method and a more judicial weighing of evidence.

In point of fact it is impossible to prove that the Pelasgi occupied all the Greek world in pre-Æchæan times, without identifying with them all the other early races of whom we have mention. Nor is it in the least necessary. The Pelasgi may have originated the Mycenæan civilization, and it may have spread from them to other peoples. That such a race existed is unquestionable, but of the extent of their influence we really know very little. Professor Ridgeway is not the first historian to lay great stress on their importance; but criticism has generally reverted to an attitude of scepticism about them.¹

Next, with regard to the connexion between the Mycenæan

¹ Cf. Holm, *History of Greece*, i. 59 [Engl. Tr.]: 'It cannot, therefore, be proved that a people, called Pelasgians, were ever of importance in the earliest ages of Greece. . . . In later antiquity more and more has been piled on the name Pelasgian, until we have come to regard them as nothing less than the earliest Greek people. But this is a mistake. If it were only a question of having a name for a scientifically proved nationality, Pelasgian would do as well as any other. . . . But the dubious point of the procedure is that the name Pelasgian is not a pure invention, but was much used in antiquity; consequently, if we apply it in an extended sense, the misconception easily arises that it originally had that wider meaning, and that most of the earlier Greeks were really called Pelasgians, which is neither demonstrable nor even probable. It has not even been proved that all the races which are now described as Pelasgians really stood in such relationship to one another as to deserve a common name.'

and Homeric civilizations. In the first blush of Schliemann's discoveries on the sites of Troy and Mycenæ it was natural to connect them, as Schliemann himself did whole-heartedly, with the Homeric lords of those great capitals. But it was not long before critical scholars began to point out discrepancies. Thus the Mycenæans buried their dead, while the Homeric heroes were cremated; iron is practically unknown in the best Mycenæan period, while it is mentioned not unfrequently in Homer; the armour of the Mycenæan deposits does not correspond with that worn by the Homeric warriors; and whereas in Homer brooches are commonly used by both sexes to hold their garments in place, these articles (which belong to the Iron Age) are not found among the Mycenæan remains. These are the most noticeable points in which the Mycenæan and the Homeric civilizations differ; and Professor Ridgeway naturally dwells upon them at length, in order to establish his thesis that the Mycenæan civilization belongs to the Pelasgi of the Bronze Age, and the Homeric to the Achæans of the Iron Age.

Unfortunately, as before, the facts are not sufficient to establish so clean-cut a distinction. In saying that in Homer 'iron is in general use for all kinds of cutting instruments and for agricultural purposes,'¹ Professor Ridgeway goes far beyond the evidence. As a matter of fact² iron is mentioned 48 times in Homer—23 times in the *Iliad* and 25 times in the *Odyssey*—while bronze is mentioned 359 times. The articles mentioned in the *Iliad* as being of iron are a club, knives, an arrow-head, axes, an axle, and the gates of Tartarus, besides a lump out of which it is said a ploughshare might be made (such a lump, perhaps, as was actually found on the site of Troy); in the *Odyssey* axes and the bonds which Athena says would not hold Odysseus. Iron swords and spears are never mentioned; and this at once differentiates the Homeric age from that represented in the cemeteries of Hallstatt and Glasinatz, with which Professor Ridgeway would identify it, and in which iron greatly predominates over bronze for those weapons. Professor Ridgeway, indeed, asserts that *χαλκός* is used in speaking of weapons solely because it was the old word for cutting weapons, and that the poet consequently meant iron when he said bronze, and he even proceeds calmly to say, 'The Homeric warrior has regularly, as we have seen, spear and sword of iron';³ but

¹ *The Early Age of Greece*, i. 294.

² See Dr. Jevons's article, 'Iron in Homer,' in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, xiii. 25 sqq. (1892.)

³ *The Early Age of Greece*, i. 294, 301.

this is a simple assumption in the teeth of the evidence. *Σίδηρος* is a word as well suited to hexameter verse as *χαλκός*, and if the poet knew of iron swords it is extremely remarkable that he should invariably have called them bronze, especially as he does use the word in connexion with other weapons (small ones, be it observed, such as knives, arrow-heads, and axe-blades). The true conclusion evidently is that the Homeric poems represent the state of things at the very beginning of the Iron Age, when bronze was still the metal mainly in use. They do not suit Professor Ridgeway's theory of a fully developed iron civilization imported by a conquering people fully acquainted with the uses of that metal, and probably owing their victory to the superiority of the weapons thus wielded by them.

In other respects, such as the practice of cremation and the use of the brooch, the distinction between the Mycenaean and Homeric societies is more evident; indeed, this distinction, implying a somewhat later date for the Homeric poems than for the perfection of Mycenaean art, has for some time been generally accepted by scholars. But these differences do not necessarily imply differences of race. At Hallstatt inhumation and cremation were practised contemporaneously, and Professor Ridgeway's statement that 'the difference of burial customs indicates a difference of race'¹ is mere assumption. A similar combination of burial practices existed at Rome, in Germany, and in England. In all cases it is probable that inhumation was the earlier custom, and that when cremation was introduced it was used chiefly by the wealthier classes; but there is no valid reason for associating the difference in practice with difference of race.

The hard, clear lines of Professor Ridgeway's theory thus show a tendency to dissolve upon examination into shadowy indefiniteness. It is the same with the last article of it upon which we can touch, the identification of the Achæans with the Celts. Professor Ridgeway's use of the term 'Celts' is, indeed, quite misleading. What he means is simply the fair-haired population of northern Europe, which in these prehistoric days had not been differentiated (or which we, in the present state of our knowledge, are not able to differentiate) into Celts and Scandinavians and Germans. Therefore when Professor Ridgeway says that the Achæans were Celts he might just as well say that they were Norsemen or Goths or Teutons; but presumably the temptation of proving Agamemnon to be an Irishman is too much for him. Apart

¹ *The Early Age of Greece*, i. 413.

vidence.
erse as
tremely
d them
on with
knives,
vidently
hings at
was still
Ridge-
ported
of that
ority of

ion and
cenæan
distinct
poems
me time
ferences
Hallstatt
neously,
ence of
assump-
isted at
es it is
nd that
by the
ociating

ory thus
shadowy
it upon
ns with
elts' is,
ply the
n these
n we, in
differen-
herefore
re Celts
r Goths
proving
Apart

from the question of terminology, however, he may very likely be right in connecting the Achæans with the fair-haired northerners. In historical times there was an intermixture of fair and dark complexions in Greece, and some at least of the Homeric heroes are expressly called fair-haired by Homer. The epithet *ξανθός* is applied to Achilles and Menelaus (but also to Rhadamanthus, who can hardly be claimed as a Celt); while as to the complexion of Odysseus there is a discrepancy of statement. But more than one wave of immigration from the north swept into Greece, and it must remain doubtful whether all Achæans were fair-haired, and whether all fair-haired inhabitants of Greece were Achæans.

Again, if the Achæans were fair-haired, iron-using Celts, while the subject population consisted of dark-haired, bronze-using Pelasgi, one would expect to find in Homer evidence of a marked distinction between the chieftains and their followers.¹ Yet all alike are called *Ἀχαιοί*: it is the general term for the Greek host; and if an alternative is required it is *Ἀργεῖοι*, which is applied similarly to leaders and led alike. The name *Πελασγοί* is never applied to the invading hosts, even when the rank and file are particularly mentioned. Yet if the two races were thus distinct, and the Homeric poems were actually (as Professor Ridgeway holds) the work of Pelasgian hands, why did they never give their countrymen their right name? Can we imagine a Saxon poet, after the Norman Conquest, speaking of his own people as Normans?

Finally, if the Achæan conquerors of Greece were an iron-using people, in the same state of culture as the warriors buried in the cemetery at Hallstatt, how is it that we find no evidence of the domination of such a people at Mycenæ? The *Iliad* is proof enough that Mycenæ was great and flourishing under its Achæan lords; yet we have no 'Hallstatt period' in the remains excavated at Mycenæ. Is it not clear from this that the great age of Mycenæ belonged to the period when iron was almost unknown, and that when the use of iron became general in Greece (which may or may not have been in connexion with a foreign invasion) the sceptre had departed from the capital in which Agamemnon had reigned?

On all these grounds, which we have been able to indicate but briefly, we are unable to accept the theory put forward

¹ This point is dwelt on by Dr. D. B. Monro in one of the valuable appendices to his recent edition of the *Odyssey*, books xiii.-xxiv. He there briefly examines Professor Ridgeway's theory, which he is not inclined to accept.

by Professor Ridgeway. There is an element of truth, no doubt, in all his contentions, the exact extent of which we cannot accurately gauge for want of evidence; but the characteristic features of his theory—the sharply marked distinctions between race and race, between age and age—are far from being satisfactorily established. We are therefore forced to fall back on the older, less cut-and-dried view which regards the Mycenæan civilization as originating, no doubt, in pre-Achæan times, but as continuing after the arrival of the Achæans, and as fully adopted by them. The Pelasgi were, no doubt, one of the races among which the Mycenæan culture was diffused; but we have no proof that it originated with them, or was confined to them, or that they monopolised the whole Ægean world in the manner supposed by Professor Ridgeway. That iron was introduced into Greece from the north there can be little doubt; but that the Achæans brought it is more than questionable. We cannot fix the date of its introduction with any precision, and its advent may well have been gradual; but it is to the period when it was still comparatively new in Greece that the Homeric poems must be referred. The civilization reflected in them is Mycenæan, but it is late Mycenæan, probably of about the eleventh century B.C. Its splendour was still great, but it was nearing the season of its eclipse.

What its splendour was in the days of its glory we are only beginning to learn. Mr. Evans, at Knossos, is supplementing the work of Dr. Schliemann at Mycenæ and Tiryns and Troy, and Professor Halbherr at Phæstos and Mr. Hogarth at the Dictæan Cave and at Zakro have added large contributions to the stock of our knowledge. We see a rich civilization, extending, about the middle of the second millennium before Christ, over the islands and coasts of the Ægean—a civilization rich in gold and skilled in the arts of decoration, of a type which we may call primitive, and which no doubt left much to be achieved by the artists of classical Hellas, but which was vastly superior in vigour and freedom to those 'archaic' Greek sculptures and vase-paintings which mark the revival of art after the catastrophe of the Dorian invasion. It is a civilization in touch with that of Egypt and influenced by it (but very little affected by that of Babylonia, as Mr. Hall shows), yet with independent characteristics of its own which forbid us to look to Asia for its origin. It is a European civilization, though at what spot precisely it took its rise is a point which archæology has still to determine. Of the history of the peoples which produced it we know

little or nothing. Archæology can restore to us concrete remains: it cannot give us detailed history. For that we need literary records; and these, unless and until Mr. Evans can find in the tablets of his Cretan script chronicles akin to the cuneiform library of Ashur-bani-pal, are almost wholly wanting. We see figures, but they are shrouded in gloom; and if we would see the gloom to any degree lifted we shall do well to strengthen, as much as in us lies, the hands of those who are labouring in the lands of the Nearer East.

We hardly think it creditable to the wealth of this country that such brilliant work should not have received fuller support than it has done. In order to do what has been already accomplished Mr. Evans has spent 2,000*l.* out of his own pocket. Funds are urgently needed to continue the work. Are there no wealthy people who would provide what is necessary to finish what has been so well begun?

ART. VI.—FOUCHÉ.

1. *Fouché, 1759-1820.* Par LOUIS MADELIN, Agrégé d'Histoire et de Géographie, Ancien Membre de l'Ecole Française de Rome. Ouvrage couronné par l'Académie Française. Deux Tomes. 8vo. (Paris, 1901.)
2. *Etude sur Fouché et sur le Communisme dans la Pratique en 1790.* Par M. le Cte. DE MARTEL, Ancien Préfet, Ancien Chef du Cabinet du Ministre de l'Intérieur. (Paris, 1873.)
3. *Etude sur Fouché.* Deuxième Partie. Fouché et Robespierre, le 9 Thermidor. Par M. le Cte. DE MARTEL. (Paris, 1879.)

M. MADELIN'S biography of Fouché affords another example of the intense and revived interest kindled throughout France in all that pertains to the era of the French Revolution. The mass of literature recently published which deals with that terrible and fascinating period is simply gigantic, and the bibliography of the man who under various guises played so conspicuous a part in it as the notorious Police Minister is so vast as to appal any but the most laborious and determined student. The bare enumeration of the authorities, contemporary and subsequent, published and manuscript, which M. Madelin has consulted fills more than twenty large octavo

pages; and that all have been conscientiously laid under contribution is shown by the ample references which M. Madelin gives to his authorities, as well as by the fulness of skilfully compressed detail which imparts life and movement to his narrative. The two other and smaller works before us are drawn up on a different plan. M. de Martel reproduces for us a series of original documents, strung together by a running commentary which exhausts the copious vocabulary of French vituperation. The *ipsissima verba* of the revolutionary edicts and proclamations issued by Fouché at Nantes and Nevers, at Moulins and Lyons, fully establish the Proconsul's guilt, and justify the reiterated and monotonous denunciation in which M. de Martel indulges. The two writers illustrate the opposite poles of historic and artistic literary treatment, and may be read simultaneously with great advantage by those who can appreciate broad sketches as well as highly finished portraiture.

The early years of Joseph Fouché need not detain us long. Born May 21, in the year 1759, the son of a Breton sea captain and shipowner, he was prevented by feeble health from following his father's calling, and, after being educated at the college of the Oratorians at Nantes, he was appointed Professor of Physics in their college at Arras. Not many traits of Fouché's college days are recorded; but we learn that his favourite authors were Pascal, the Port-Royalist, and Massillon, whose *Petit Carême* often lay under his pillow. A good priest, the Abbé Merault de Bis, encouraged the young Oratorian in his studies, gave him free access to his library, and fostered in him the germs of a promising if precocious piety; but, although tonsured, Fouché did not receive priest's orders. A life of blameless morality, a marked capacity for friendship, an obscure and quiet existence as a provincial professor, such was the career which destiny had apparently marked out for Joseph Fouché.

It was just at the moment when both the provincial and central authorities had rejected Fouché's petition for improved scientific apparatus that a lawsuit brought by the owner of a lightning conductor obliged his advocate to consult the scientists of the Oratory. The case excited much interest, and gave wide notoriety to the pleader engaged in it, one Maximilien Robespierre, a member of the provincial *états* of Artois. A warm friendship sprang up between the advocate and the professor, which subsequently was strengthened by Fouché's engagement to Robespierre's sister, Charlotte, and by his pecuniary assistance to her brother

when, in April 1789, he left Arras to take his seat among the representatives of the Tiers Etat at Versailles. The new ideas were spreading in every direction, and the younger members of the Oratory embraced them with enthusiasm. An exchange of professorships with the professor of physics at Nantes introduced Fouché to a yet more turbulent arena. The Congregation of the Oratory was in full revolt, and had taken the civic oath. After the fashion of the day a club of 'the Young Friends of the Constitution' had been formed among the pupils, and soon a deputation complained to the Directory that their headmaster had set them impositions, in violation of the principles of liberty, equality, and fraternity. It was evident that all the bonds of discipline were strained to the utmost. The Oratory was shattered. It might be necessary, without breaking away from his post as head of the college, that Fouché should seek his future in another sphere.

His first essay was not a happy one. As President of the 'Friends of the Constitution' Fouché wrote to congratulate Brissot upon his motion in favour of slave emancipation. Forthwith all Nantes was up in arms. True, the city had only just despatched missionaries to London to preach 'universal benevolence;' but abstract philanthropy was one thing, concrete fact another, and the merchants and mariners of Nantes were largely dependent—Fouché himself among them—on the slave plantations of St. Domingo. Before the loud outcry his letter occasioned Fouché made a rapid change of front. He wrote to Brissot that the Society had only desired to compliment him on his energetic resistance to the enemies of the Constitution, and had no intention of endorsing opinions which were highly dangerous. The incident is significant of Fouché's subsequent career. Nantes was essentially conservative, and the Fouché of 1790 was therefore conservative too. For the next two years he remained principal of the college. In September 1792 he married Bonne-Jeanne Coiquaud, elder daughter of the president of the administration of the district of Nantes. A few days later he was chosen to be representative of the Loire Inférieure in the Legislative Assembly.

The constituency of the Loire Inférieure was essentially conservative, and it was by professing conservative opinions that Fouché and his seven colleagues won its suffrages. In the Convention Fouché took his place on the Right, while Robespierre, from whom he was already estranged, sat on the opposite benches. Among Fouché's personal friends at this period Condorcet and Daunou were the most noted. Fouché

of Nantes was as yet an unknown man, waiting on Providence, watching the signs of the times, and undergoing a useful training upon financial and other parliamentary committees. The discussion on national education brought Fouché to the tribune with the report of the committee, drawn up in September 1792. In supporting it he vowed, in an impassioned speech, that he would never consent to the alienation of the existing educational endowments, which were mostly in the hands of the Congregation of the Oratory. In the following year he published some reflections on public education, which vehemently denounced the Congregationalist system, branded all religion as hypocrisy and superstition, anathematized State payment of the priesthood, and demanded that all education should be based on pure reason only. This astounding change of front finds its explanation in the events that happened during the interval. The moderate party had been vanquished, and the death of Louis XVI. decreed January 21, 1793. It is mere waste of time to endeavour to fathom the motives which induced Fouché to vote with the majority. In after years he asserted that he was alarmed at the report that the King was bringing a German army to Paris; that his youthful spirit was intoxicated with the republican maxims of Athens and Sparta; that he was deluded by the representation not of the true Louis, but of the phantom monster set before the Convention. M. Madelin sweeps all such flimsy excuses aside. Fouché intoxicated! Fouché indignant! Fouché credulous! The man never lost his head or betrayed a symptom of fear, even when Robespierre publicly proscribed him. That his constituents at Nantes abhorred the King's condemnation was unquestionable; but he braved their wrath and his own misgivings under the conviction that the Jacobins were masters of the situation.

Whatever guilt attaches to Fouché for his regicide vote a far deeper and indelible stain is branded on his memory by the famous 'Missions' to Nantes, Nevers, and Moulins, and the wholesale massacres at Lyons. Yet absolutely inexcusable as Fouché was in inspiring and countenancing these enormities, M. Madelin contends—and alleges plausible reasons for his contention—that he was all the while wearing a mask. The chill ferocity of his letters is in stupefying contrast to his acts, so far as we can judge the latter by the accusations laid against him before the Convention of 1794. His own reports mingle declarations of the loftiest humanity with the roar of cannon that mow down two, three, or five hundred aristocrats

at a single discharge. The indictments of his accusers complain only of arbitrary arrests, of irregularity in levying taxes, of the detention of a score of innocent citizens in prison, of the public preaching of atheism. His adoption of terrorism is the more culpable because extremes were alien to his natural temperament. But he was clear-sighted enough to foresee that in the impending struggle between the Girondists and the Dantonists the more ferocious party would prevail, and he then, as always, deliberately sided with the stronger, regardless of any other motive, human or divine.

His choice once made Fouché pursued it ruthlessly. Already his indefatigable industry was displayed in a torrent of edicts which quickened the zeal of sluggish patriotism and rallied thousands to the republican standards. Successive proclamations denounced the poltroonery of false republicans and called for their expulsion from the ranks; ordained the secularization of Church property and the abolition of all religions as subversive of morality; enacted social equality and a system of general education from which religion was expressly excluded; confiscated the property of *émigrés*, and ordered lands to be cultivated at the expense of absentees, while the crops should belong to the labourers who tilled them. The effect of these ordinances was soon manifest in the regiments despatched for the defence of the Republic and the treasure remitted to the central authority in Paris. Waggon loads laden with the spoils of a thousand sacristies—chalices, monstrances, reliquaries, jewelled and of the daintiest workmanship—copes and vestments of costliest material and design, and stiff with gold embroidery, the priceless gifts of centuries of devotion, the choicest works of art that self-sacrifice could secure and piety could sanctify, the unique treasure that could never be again replaced: all were swept from the sanctuaries which had so long sheltered them and sold at bankrupt prices to help provision the army, sold for the melting pot, or bought by greedy speculators to produce rich profit when happier days returned.

These extreme measures were prompted by the condition of things which Fouché found throughout the west, and which proved that the Revolution was most distasteful not only to the *noblesse* and the clergy, but to the bourgeois and the general population. It was necessary at first to proceed with caution, and Fouché wrote to Chaumette, 'I am compelled to adopt the policy of Machiavelli, or I should cause a premature explosion.' On his arrival at Nantes Fouché accordingly practised all the artifices of a consummate demagogue. He was

accessible to everyone, declared his intention of doing justice to all alike, paraded his love for the justice which is not vengeance, but is inseparable from clemency and generosity. All was to be done for the welfare of humanity. The reign of universal peace was proclaimed. These incentives to patriotism were fittingly crowned by the 'civic baptism' of Fouché's infant daughter, born at Nevers on August 10, 1793. At the high altar of the country erected in the Place de la Fédération, with much tawdry pomp and bastard ceremonial, surrounded by a crowd of patriots and of the National Guard, with Citizen Damour as godfather and Citoyenne Champ-robert as godmother, Fouché publicly acknowledged as his own legitimate offspring the child to whom the name of Nièvre was given. The weakling lingered through a year which devoted her father to the undying execration of posterity and touched the heart which a thousand crimes had only served to render more callous.

From philanthropic platitudes and pasteboard profanities there was an abrupt transition to sterner realities. News came from Paris that the faction of Chaumette and of the Terror was gaining the mastery, and Fouché hastened to anticipate their utmost desires. On October 9 he issued a proclamation which was the first official recognition of atheism. All public worship beyond the walls of the different churches, all wearing of ecclesiastical dress outside the sacred precincts, all display of religious emblems in the public streets or squares was forthwith prohibited. In one common burial-ground for all classes alike, isolated from all habitations and planted with trees, there was to be erected a solitary statue representing sleep; while over the entrance these words were ordered to be inscribed: 'Death is an eternal sleep.'

The protagonist of atheism, whose *pronunciamiento* afforded a model for wide imitation throughout France, can also claim to have been the prime author and apostle of the Commune. At Nantes, at Nevers, at Moulins, at Lyons edict after edict denounced the possession of wealth as an outrage on the poor, and enjoined the duty that lay upon all patriots to carry out measures of confiscation for the benefit of humanity. Only a perusal of these atrocious proclamations, for which we have not space in these pages, will convey an adequate idea of the universal ruin they prescribed.

M. Madelin does not support M. de Martel's assertion that it was at this period of shameless and general rapine that Fouché laid the foundations of his gigantic fortune. For the moment he was perhaps too absorbed in maintaining his

reputation as a relentless Terrorist, which he was soon further to establish on an impregnable rock of infamy, but there was ample opportunity for speculation, of which some of the patriots took full advantage. The Revolution was rapidly descending on the downward path of Communism. The nobility and the priests had been got rid of, and now the merchant and commercial classes were proscribed, and with universal terror there would soon be complete stagnation in business and consequent universal misery. Ominous murmurs were rising and bitter complaints were reaching Paris, and Fouché was glad to leave Nantes to the tender mercies of Carrier and take up the work of exacting vengeance upon Lyons, whither he was despatched as second commissioner under Collot d'Herbois.

Of all the black catalogue of crimes that sullied the French Revolution none were darker than the scenes enacted in the great commercial metropolis of France. The town of Lyons, the second in population and importance in the kingdom, had been guilty of resisting the dictation of the Committee of Public Safety in Paris; had opened its gates to a royalist army, and had sent to the scaffold a republican leader named Chalier. Such audacity inflamed the Jacobins of Paris to ungovernable frenzy. In opposition to the policy of Robespierre, who was in favour of conciliatory measures, the famous or infamous decree of October 12 was passed by the Convention and declared: 'The town of Lyons shall be destroyed, and all the quarter inhabited by the rich shall be levelled. The collection of houses that remains shall bear the name of Ville Affranchie. On the ruins of Lyons shall be erected a column to testify to posterity the crimes of the Royalists of that city and its punishment, with this inscription: "Lyons made war against liberty; Lyons is no more."'

The task of accomplishing this horrible threat had proceeded but slowly under Couthon when Collot d'Herbois was despatched to supersede him. The new commissioner was a ruffian of the most degraded type, a *ci-devant* fourth-rate actor, a drunkard, and a debauchee, with all the blatant rant and vanity of a low poltroon, and all the excesses of a libertine clothed with unbridled power. To this coarse scoundrel there was now to be allied the subtle, sagacious, witty, and self-possessed ex-Oratorian; and, incredible as it sounds, he did not abjure the connexion. While partly screening himself behind D'Herbois he did not shrink from the most outrageous proposals of wholesale spoliation and butchery. The proclamations of the two commissioners might have issued from

a madhouse filled with victims of homicidal frenzy. Hell was let loose on Lyons.

The partisans of Châlier had succeeded in fanning popular fury to the utmost pitch of insanity, and a public fête marked with the most horrible profanity was held to celebrate the apotheosis of the martyr. Words only applicable to the blessed Redeemer were addressed to him, and the commissioners bowed solemnly before his bust, which was placed on the high altars from which the priests had fled in terror. Our pen refuses to reproduce on these pages the blasphemies which Collot in the nation's name uttered ostentatiously in the Place des Terreaux, in the renowned cradle of French Christianity. The vengeance solemnly promised to appease the manes of Châlier was worthy of such an inauguration. Murmurs arose that the tribunals were too dilatory, the prisons too restricted, the guillotine too slow for the multitude of the guilty, and speedier methods of retribution must be adopted. A new commission of seven was appointed, which within a few weeks condemned to death over two thousand citizens. The trials were of the briefest, the avowed object being at once to purge the community and to clear the overcrowded dungeons for fresh inmates. But how to be rid of the condemned! The commission recommended the use of cannon, and Fouché signed the decrees that authorized it.

On December 4, 1793, there was witnessed for the first time a novel spectacle of horror. On the plain of Les Brotteaux, between two parallel ditches, to serve as their place of sepulchre, sixty-four young persons tied together, two and two, were drawn up before the guns of the revolutionary army. The victims sang out the *chant du départ* as, at a signal from the platform where the representatives were seated, the cannon were discharged and mowed down at one blow the troop of martyrs. In a moment the *chant* was changed into piercing shrieks from the mass of mutilated forms, most of whom were still living and were brutally finished off with blows from swords and axes by the soldiers. Eleven days later the same scene was repeated, but this time no less than 209 were massacred. To the Committee of Public Safety the commissioners wrote, 'We experience a secret satisfaction, a solid enjoyment; nature resumes her rights, humanity appears avenged, the country is consoled and the Republic saved by being put on its true foundation, on the ashes of its cowardly oppressors. . . . Terror, veritable terror, is here the order of the day.' This letter, every syllable of which is

stamped with the most odious cynicism and hypocrisy, bears side by side the signatures of Collot and Fouché.

Exasperation, terror, grief were all inflamed beyond endurance, and their voice at last made itself heard in the capital. Collot was summoned to Paris, and his appearance before the Convention was a triumph; but the note of warning had been sounded and Fouché began to prepare for a retreat. For the moment indeed his pen was as ferocious and his hand as blood-stained as ever. Another holocaust of over two hundred souls was offered to the revolutionary Moloch, but Fouché began to profess disgust at his task, and to plead that he was only obeying the orders of Collot and the Convention. The rapid interchange of parties at the capital, where Hébert, Danton, and Robespierre were contending for the mastery with elaborate and ever shifting intrigue and alternate success and failure, was infinitely perplexing, and to be suspected of moderatism was still a deadly hazard, but Fouché risked his life in protecting some of the *suspects*, and through them in warning others of their danger. It is pleasant to read that among these was an old member of the Oratory and professor of physics at the college of Juilly. 'You regret Juilly?' 'I have more reason to regret it than you!' and then opening his mind to him Fouché said, 'The agents of the Revolution are wretches and madmen; I am more their slave than their master.' Strange to say Robespierre, who had at first protested against the massacres, became a Terrorist at the moment when Fouché turned over to the moderates and took effective measures to repress the Terror at Lyons. These proceedings were viewed with disfavour by Robespierre's adherents in Lyons, and Fouché was recalled to Paris by a resolution of the Committee of Public Safety which reached him on April 1, 1794, and which ordered all proceedings against the patriots to be suspended. Was his sudden *volte-face* then a blunder? Had he miscalculated the turn events were taking? Was it destined that the confederate of Collot should fall under the accusation of lukewarmness?

The chapter describing the death struggle between Fouché and Robespierre which ended in the victory of Thermidor is a masterpiece of vivid, nervous narrative. Only nine months had passed since Fouché quitted the capital, but there had been crowded into them the work of a century. Fouché had been the chief agent of the Terror over a fourth part of France. He had grappled with enormous difficulties.

'He had not only levied, armed, provisioned and sent under fire many thousands of troops to Mans, to Caen, to Nantes, to Lyons, to Toulon; he had not only tried to destroy by fire and sword, by mine and mitrailleuse, a city of 100,000 inhabitants "for the happiness of mankind"; he had not only overturned twenty communal administrations, district and departmental, transforming Directorial and Girondist municipalities into Jacobin powers, dictating laws, annulling marriages, condemning criminals; he had attempted, two years before Babeuf, to make the political revolution communist, he had striven, two years after the civil constitution of the clergy, to establish official atheism. His communistic decrees had inspired the great commune of Paris. His atheistic proclamations had swept over the south-west up to the Pyrenees. His passage was thus marked through thirty departments by fire and bloodshed amid the ruins of all order, political, social and religious. In Paris he had been passionately discussed. It was no obscure and ordinary commissary who, worn out, suffering, prematurely aged, reappeared with his wife and their dying infant at his third floor in the Rue St. Honoré on April 8, 1794' (i. 152-3).

Next day he took his seat in the Convention on the benches of the Mountain, in which Robespierre was just making terrible gaps. Vergniaud, Daunou, Condorcet, Hébert, Cloutz, Ronsin, Chaumette, Danton, Camille Desmoulins—the ablest, the boldest, the most learned, the most winning, as well as the bloodiest and most brutal—had perished under the hatred of Maximilien the Incorruptible. Some of them had been Fouché's closest associates—Ronsin in the massacres of Lyons, Chaumette in the establishment of atheism—while Robespierre stood out as the champion of property and of theism. Some of them had enjoyed the support of the country, or the Commune, or the Convention; but all had fallen before the tortuous policy of Robespierre. He had undermined giants, and their ruin had made him king, and his royalty was sustained by the persistent terror and the monstrous popularity that success inspires. And the man himself was no raving madman, but a cool, calculating politician, blessed with inordinate pride and superb self-reliance; absolutely confident of his mission and his ideals; ready to sacrifice without compunction the bosom friend of to-day in order to further the project of to-morrow; calmly representing and believing himself to be the incarnation of Liberty, the Revolution, and the Republic, and his foes as necessarily their worst enemies; never forgetful of a slight, incapable of gratitude for a favour, crafty, insinuating, impenetrable, imperious. Robespierre has been justly termed the Pope of the Revolution.

Such was the man whom Fouché had now to face in the full plenitude of power, which for the moment appeared as irresistible as it was merciless. The Convention was terrorized, the Commune crushed, the country stupefied. Each day it was whispered that fresh names were added to lists of the proscribed that were circulated, and Fouché's name was prominent in all of them. So widespread was the consternation that sixty deputies dared not sleep at their own homes. Forty more feigned sickness and took to their beds. True Robespierre had bitter enemies—Legendre, Tallien, Barras, Collot, Billaud, Cambon, Carnot; but abler men than they had perished, and the survivors were paralyzed by uncertainty and mutual distrust. They had no common bond of action and no leader to weld them together until Fouché appeared upon the scene.

In all that terrible and motley group of politicians there was none who had more reason than Fouché to fear the enmity of Robespierre. In the clash of official administration they had been frequently at variance, and Fouché had won unpardonable triumphs. Their mode of thought was essentially conflicting. Robespierre was a stern doctrinaire, priding himself on immutable theories. Fouché was the supple prince of opportunists whose principles were ever changeable as the necessities of the moment should dictate. This strong political antagonism was envenomed by the poisoned stimulus of personal and private animosity—early intimacy chilled by after dissension, by the slight passed on Robespierre's sister, by the unwelcome memory of pecuniary obligation. It would be a struggle *à outrance*, and all the odds were in favour of the reigning dictator.

We cannot follow the details of the long-drawn conflict. More than once during its continuance Fouché seemed hopelessly lost. The Convention and the Jacobins, the Commune and the capitalists were all with Robespierre; but Fouché's confidence and courage ever rose with the rising tide of danger. The victory, won after alternate spasms of success and failure, was one of Fouché's proudest recollections. In 1815, when warned against the wrath of Napoleon, he answered, 'On a certain day Robespierre said, "Within a fortnight Fouché's head or mine must fall on the scaffold." It was *his* that fell.'

Would the fall of Robespierre, secured through a temporary alliance with the Centre, prove fatal to the victors? Would the Moderate party turn upon their new allies and despatch Billaud-Varennes and Collot d'Herbois, Tallien and

Fouché to the galleys or the guillotine? It is significant of the even balance of parties that every new combination among these distracted and discordant politicians suggested the fear of a reaction when the shrift of regicides would be short and stern. This consideration probably drove Fouché back again to the extremists. Again the struggle was long and arduous, and the denunciation of Fouché conclusively damning. All Tallien's eloquence was exhausted in the exposure of Fouché's crimes, while deputations from Nevers, Moulins, Clamecy, and Gannat swelled the indictment to a chorus of universal reprobation, until, after exhaustive debate, the condemnation and immediate arrest of Fouché of Nantes was decreed by the Convention. With what subtlety of intrigue and adroit special pleading he waged the unequal battle—now alleging that he had only been the instrument of others, now extenuating his actions by the jeopardy of the Republic, now urging the kindness he had extended to many of the proscribed Lyonnais; playing many parts simultaneously, communist, extremist, moderate, and displaying in all of them shameless audacity and consummate ability, so that when, twelve months later, all the leading Montagnards had perished on the scaffold or were rotting in the hulks, Fouché of Nantes was still at large, awaiting the counterplot which, supported by Napoleon's artillery, at once established the Directorate and plunged Fouché into impenetrable obscurity.

The three years which followed the success of Vendémiaire 1795 were years of poverty, wearisome inactivity, and repeated disappointment. Fouché did not obtain a seat in the new Representative Assembly, and his only powerful friend was Barras, whom he vainly plied with solicitations for employment. His private income was almost lost, owing to political changes at home and in the colonies, and he was even driven from his 'dog-hole' in the Rue St. Honoré, then overshadowed by the death of his child, and banished to the vale of Montmorency. At length an army contract, obtained through Barras's intervention, brought him into contact with Ouvrard and Hinguerlot, the great financiers of the hour, and his versatile talents were directed to the money market. Another turn of the political wheel of fortune saw Carnot and Barthélemy expelled from the Directorate, the elections annulled in four departments, the Royalists crushed, and Fouché gazetted, October 6, 1798, as French envoy to the Cisalpine Republic. His failure to retain this office was abundantly redeemed by his appointment to a like position

ficant of
bination
uggested
ould be
Fouché
as long
clusively
l in the
Nevers,
ent to a
e debate,
f Nantes
otlety of
unequal
strument
ly of the
to many
s simul-
displaying
bility, so
agnards
e hulks,
interplot
established
penetrable

démiaire
and re-
at in the
ul friend
ions for
owing to
he was
oré, then
d to the
obtained
act with
he hour,
market.

Carnot
elections
ned, and
y to the
office was
position

in the Batavian Republic, which, under complicated difficulties, he filled with such rapid and signal success that he was selected by both Barras and Sieyès, despite their strong antipathy to one another, to be Minister of the General Police on the 2nd Thermidor, 1799. The stability he desired was not possible under a Directory distracted by mutual distrust and enmity, whose leading members, Barras and Sieyès, were already traitors to the constitution under which they held their powers.

It was under these circumstances that Fouché was recalled from Italy to resume the Ministry of the Police, and his biographer indulges in some caustic reflexions on the oath he was required to take on accepting office, an oath of hatred not only of the Jacobinism of which for three years he had been the coryphæus, but also of royalty, for which he would become a Secretary of State under the brother of Louis XVI.; an oath of attachment to the constitution which he was to overturn with Bonaparte on the 18th Brumaire, and to the republic whose death he was destined to hasten in 1804. Five days later there issued from the Hôtel de Juigné, on the Quai Voltaire, a proclamation from the Minister of the General Police to the French citizens, of which thousands of copies were printed and distributed. It was couched in terms of almost incredible audacity, at a time when none but the generals dared speak out, and was published without being first submitted to the Directory.

'To watch over all and for all,' so it ran, 'is the duty imposed on me under circumstances which demand exceptional energy and severity. At this moment the enemies of liberty are all in arms: without, they menace the territory of the Republic which they impiously promise to share among themselves: within, they stir up passion with a view to produce confusion and disorder. I have solemnly engaged to re-establish internal tranquillity: to put an end to the massacre as well as to the oppression of Republicans, to arrest the plots of traitors, and to snatch from the foreigner all hope of accomplices. Aid me, citizens, in this honourable task. Support me by your zeal, encircle me with your patriotism, and let this happy union of citizens and magistrates be the assured presage of the triumph of the Republic.'

The lofty independence of this manifesto was followed by corresponding energy in action. Fouché was convinced that a policy of *juste milieu* was indispensable, and he was determined to uphold it with impartial firmness. Vain were the outcries of Royalist and Jacobin. 'What will you do with the Jacobin Club?' 'I am going to dissolve it,' was

the calm reply. It seemed incredible. The Club was openly supported by Bernadotte, the Minister of War, by Marbot, the Governor of Paris, by General Jourdan, the president of the Five Hundred. To the first of these, who then had no dreams of a throne, he said, 'Imbecile, where are you going and what do you want?' and when Bernadotte boasted of his Jacobinism he added, 'Recollect that if after to-morrow, when I have to deal with your club, I find you at its head, your own shall fall from its shoulders. I give you my word for it, and I will keep it.' Bernadotte yielded, and the two became fast friends. The threat to close the famous 'Société Constitutionnelle,' which for more than a year had terrorized the Directory, was carried out much after the fashion in which Cromwell dissolved the Long Parliament. Fouché expelled the members, locked the doors, and put the keys in his pocket. 'Probably,' says M. Madelin, 'the 27th Thermidor' (the date of this exploit) 'even more than the 18th Brumaire, which made Napoleon First Consul, won the dukedom of Otranto for the intrepid Police Minister.' Meanwhile the Directory he was upholding so ably was daily losing ground. Barras was treating with the Bourbons, Sieyès was dreaming of a military dictator. The hour was come but the man was wanting. What direct share Fouché had in devising the conspiracy which deposed the Directory and installed Napoleon as First Consul is somewhat uncertain; so little did the future Emperor know of the Police Minister that he kept him waiting for an hour in his ante-chamber, until Réal explained, 'He is just the man we want in such a transaction, and I have initiated him into the plot.' It was the first meeting between Napoleon and Fouché, and the future Emperor was speedily convinced of his ability. The bargain between them was struck on the spot.

Who could analyze the complex feelings which this strange being inspired in Napoleon and those which Fouché entertained for the Emperor? How singular was the association of these two men, the soldier of fortune and the upstart professor, the man of authority and the man of the Revolution, the passionate Corsican and the cool Breton, the genius of rapid conceptions and startling strokes and that of long-drawn combinations and secret intrigues! They knew and so judged one another on the 18th Brumaire, and during sixteen years they lived sometimes as colleagues, often in opposition, studying one another while they acted in concert, and ceaselessly measuring one another's aims. Napoleon knew all Fouché's intrigues with his foes, but he thought that the

blood
Bourbo
Minist
the de
Sire,'
'that v
Majest
ought
day to
imper
off by
Empe
not to
play,'
of wra
activit
made
his so
again
supple
summ
for six
so un
the un
the D
their
again

M
evolu
mere
ment
honey
was i
suspe
antag
overt
out
whos
make
rife a
and
wher
head
of he
of th

was openly
Marbot, the
ent of the
en had no
you going
boasted of
to-morrow,
t its head,
e you my
ed, and the
e famous
a year had
after the
Parliament
nd put the
e the 27th
e than the
al, won the
r.' Mean-
daily losing
ieyès was
come but
hé had in
ctory and
ertain; so
nister that
mber, until
in such a
t.' It was
é, and the
lity. The

this strange
ché enter-
association
the upstart
e Revolu-
the genius
at of long-
new and so
ng sixteen
opposition,
and cease-
knew all
t that the

blood of Louis XVI. made an impassable trench between the Bourbons and Fouché of Nantes. He liked to taunt his Minister of Police with this painful souvenir: 'You voted for the death of Louis, monsieur le duc d'Otrante.' 'Certainly, Sire,' replied the irritated but always phlegmatic minister; 'that was the first service I was permitted to render to your Majesty.' Such cool rejoinders amused the autocrat. 'I ought to have had your head struck off,' Napoleon said one day to him. 'That would not be my advice, Sire,' was the imperturbable reply. 'What would you do if I were carried off by a cannon ball or some other accident?' asked the Emperor. 'I would seize as much power as I could, so as not to be mastered by circumstances.' 'Certainly it is fair play,' Napoleon replied. In his most ungovernable outbursts of wrath Napoleon retained his sense of Fouché's value; his activity, his intelligence, his application, his quick perception made him invaluable, even when he opposed and contradicted his sovereign. He did not take amiss his standing out against his passionate and imperious commands. The man's suppleness amused and his ability pleased him, and his consummate management of the police was indispensable. So for six long years the close association of the two remained so unbroken, despite their well founded mutual distrust and the unceasing efforts of Napoleon's minions to foment it, that the Duchesse d'Abrantès said of their quarrels, 'It is no use their returning letters and portraits; they always make it up again.'

M. Madelin devotes a long and interesting chapter to the evolution of the general police of France from its origin as merely of a branch of the *maison du roi* to its final development under the Empire. In a day when the country was honeycombed with intrigue and each successive government was in constant dread of insurrection; when adversaries were suspected from the most opposite quarters, whose fundamental antagonism would yet not prevent their combination and overturn the existing *régime*; when every department throughout France nurtured its own native brood of insurgents, whose restlessness was so fanned by foreign capital as to make a profitable trade of treason; when discontent was so rife among the clergy that every parish priest was a *suspect* and every religious seminary a hotbed of sedition; and when all these complicated factions of disorder had their head centres in the capital with its vast *ouvrier* population of hereditary volatility and explosive violence, the Minister of the General Police of France held probably the most

important position of any servant of the country and the crown. He was responsible for the maintenance of public order, and required a whole army of subordinates, divided into territorial sections and enrolled under the most varied categories. A wide network of detectives, gendarmerie, and spies covered all France from the sands of Brittany to the shores of the Mediterranean, frequented the wine shops of country *cabarets* and the *salons* of the faubourgs, reported the latest arrival of a Royalist agent from abroad, the unrest of a Chouan commune, the suspicious expenditure of a village cultivator. Each district had its distinct body of officials, whose independent and separate reports were submitted daily to the Minister, who alone held the key to their combined significance, and could alone detect the first symptoms of a conspiracy before it had time to gather strength or even to be suspected by those who furnished the clue to its discovery.

Fouché's tenure of office from 1799 to 1815 was not unbroken. The story of its exercise is mainly filled with the record of innumerable plots, Royalist or republican, against the existing Government, a record which is only rendered interesting by relating details for which we have no space. The political atmosphere was charged with electricity in the most opposite directions, and clumsy manipulation might easily produce an explosion. The network of espionage which Fouché had woven was too delicate for any less skilful handling than his own, and needed a touch both light and firm. With unerring tact he knew exactly where to strike effectively and yet to avoid all needless agitation. He consistently opposed extreme measures, and so incurred the wrath of Napoleon, whose detestation of the republicans was unbounded, and that of his *entourage*, who persistently supported the reactionists, and the latter, after many attempts, secured the suppression of the Ministry of Police, as no longer requisite after the Peace of Amiens. The rank of Senator for Aix, with an income of 20,000 livres, and a further gift of 1,200,000 francs paid down, gilded a dismissal which was further softened by the First Consul's assurance that he should still receive with pleasure Fouché's information and advice. Napoleon soon found that he had abundant need of them, that the unofficial reports of the ex-Minister exposed the incapacity of his successor and revealed Fouché's grasp of the situation. 'Consult Fouché,' the First Consul repeatedly wrote to Réal, who was now at the head of the police, and a series of blunders, crowned by the infamous murder of the

Duc
whic
poig
time
beso
to t
rest
duly

by
and
Nap
such
Geo
Mor
the
Eng
wat
Nap
unc
sum
than
sag
Nor
hea
det
self
who
sup
spu
vig
bria
Em
in t
gain
rete

Rev
and
cou
ina
and
that
rem
thor

Duc d'Enghien, provoked a furious outburst of discontent, which placed Napoleon's life in peril. 'The air is full of poignards,' was Fouché's note of warning. A yet further timely service—the passing by the Senate of the decree which besought the First Consul to assume the Imperial crown—led to the re-establishment of the Ministry of Police and the restoration of Fouché to its direction. The official *Moniteur* duly announced the appointment, July 11, 1804.

All the vigilance of the reinstalled Minister was roused by the perils that surrounded the new-born Empire. First and foremost of these was the conspiracy with which Moreau, Napoleon's ablest general, was implicated, and which kindled such enthusiasm on the great soldier's behalf in Paris that Georges, the famous Chouan leader, said, 'If I were in Moreau's place I would sleep to-night in the Tuileries.' Then the activity of the Royalist reaction, sustained by help from England in the south and west of France, needed unremitting watchfulness. The hostility of the clergy, justly irritated by Napoleon's ill-treatment of the Pope, was further cause of unceasing anxiety. Never were the Police Minister's consummate astuteness and duplicity more signally exerted than at this period of his ministry. He traced with unerring sagacity and crushed with an iron hand successive plots in Normandy and Brittany, in the south of France and the heart of Paris. He laid before his suspicious master all their details with masterly lucidity, not hesitating in his absolute self-reliance to include his own name in the list of those on whose aid the conspirators were believed to be relying for support. He gathered up the scattered threads of intrigue spun in England and Jersey, and hunted down with such vigorous precision their leaders—Prigent, Armand de Chateaubriand, Le Chevalier, Goyon Vaucouleur—as to extort the Emperor's admiration and make himself indispensable. Yet in the pursuit of these measures of repression he contrived to gain the ear of Louis XVIII., and so to prepare for his retention of office after the restoration of the Bourbons.

It is remarkable that so terrific an upheaval as the French Revolution should have thrown up only two men, Talleyrand and Fouché, who, surviving the Directory and the Consulate, could claim the rank of statesmen when the Empire was inaugurated. Until 1808 they had been bitter opponents and had pelted each other with fierce epigrams. 'It is strange that Fouché should hold so low an opinion of human nature,' remarked a friend to Talleyrand. 'He knows himself thoroughly,' was the reply. 'A minister of police is a person

who first applies himself to that which concerns him and then to that which does not concern him,' was another *mot* of the ex-bishop, which deeply offended his rival. When Talleyrand was nominated Vice-Grand Elector Fouché remarked, 'It is the only vice he has not already, and will not count for much amongst so many of them.' No small astonishment was consequently occasioned by the sudden and ostentatious reconciliation brought about through the intervention of D'Hauterive. Men began to ask what *the two conspirators*, as Metternich called them, were brewing. Every movement of the Police Minister was reported to the Emperor, then absent at the front. He was plotting his master's downfall. He was burning compromising papers. Of this chronicle of scandal Fouché knew every detail, and could reply to it effectively. 'Burning papers, was he? Yes, he was always burning papers, his pigeon-holes were choked with them,' and then, with the subtlest *persiflage* and the most venomous pleasantry, he would turn upon his opponents and describe their private life and their political conduct, their indiscretions, their gallantries, their conjugal misfortunes, until each was hopelessly discredited or compromised.

How far the idea of overturning Napoleon was ever entertained in the fertile brain of the Police Minister, who had just been honoured with the title of Duc d'Otrante, will probably never be revealed. Some of his contemporaries believed it, and even those Bonapartists who discredited the story vehemently protested against the excessive power which Fouché's union of two great ministries bestowed. Napoleon's suspicions were aroused. The tone of his despatches suddenly changed, and Fouché was relieved of the portfolio of the Home Office. With superb self-control Fouché affected the utmost satisfaction at being freed from duties which were incompatible with the proper fulfilment of the Ministry of Police. And the Emperor, while he severely blamed the calling out of the National Guard of Paris, wrote, 'This mistake by no means effaces the merit of all you have done for my service.'

Yet how deep was the Emperor's mingled distrust and displeasure is strikingly illustrated by a scene which occurred within a week of Fouché's receipt of the commendation we have just quoted. On October 26, 1809, Napoleon arrived at Fontainebleau post haste from Spain, and next day Fouché was peremptorily summoned to attend. What passed at the long and stormy interview can only be conjectured from its strange *dénouement*. On leaving the imperial cabinet Fouché

found General Ségur, with whom he was on far from friendly terms, waiting in the antechamber, and, to the General's boundless astonishment, the Police Minister in the greatest agitation went straight up to him and led him off for a long walk in the Forest of Fontainebleau.

'There, in one long passionate and terrific monologue he repassed before Ségur, who was at once stupefied and deeply moved, his terrible past, endeavouring to justify it all—his adhesion to the Revolution of 1789, to the republic in '92, his vote in January '93, his odious missions in the year II, recalling the part he had taken on the 9th Thermidor, in the ruin of the Jacobins under the Directory, in the *coup d'état* of Brumaire and the establishment of the Empire, the whole in a tone of such vehement self-exculpation that his confidant could not but conclude that the minister had been obliged, in the Emperor's cabinet, to be silent under too cruel recriminations' (ii. 136).

There were, however, two burning questions of the hour in the management of which Fouché's experience and tact were indispensable—the struggle with the Roman priesthood and the preparation for the impending divorce. Fouché's manner of handling the recalcitrant clergy was a masterpiece of political vigour combined with the keenest regard for his own self-interest. He put down all attempts to violate the fundamental principles of the Revolution with relentless severity, suppressed all missions or other associations which under a religious title would foster the reaction, maintained with unyielding firmness the most absolute religious equality, and braved the wrath of Cardinal Fesch and the Jesuits. At the same time he recognized how just was the indignation roused by Napoleon's unworthy treatment of Pius VII., and sheltered many of the cardinals and other dignitaries from the Emperor's brutality so adroitly that all the blame for cruelty was imputed to the sovereign and all the credit for indulgence was assigned to his minister.

In the controversy that raged about the selection of an empress to take the place of the outraged Josephine Fouché earnestly advocated a marriage with the Russian royal family, on political and personal grounds. He deprecated the choice of a niece of Marie Antoinette as affording an inevitable stimulus to the reaction, and prophesied with statesmanlike sagacity the dangers of so unnatural an alliance. It required little foresight to understand how it would imperil the position of a regicide minister, but Fouché struggled bravely and for a time successfully. When the Empress arrived she played her first game at whist with the two regicides Cambacérès

and Fouché, but her household was composed of rallied Royalists, and the entire Court swarmed henceforward with those to whom the man of Nantes and Lyons was utter abomination. The enormous mass of notes belonging to the years 1809 and 1810 show how ably and unceasingly Fouché fought to maintain his ground with no other ally than his own unique combination of audacity and dexterity. Yet the great position he had so strenuously established was undermined by his own hand, and he was finally and deservedly hoist by his own petard.

No part of Napoleon's policy was so distasteful to Fouché as his persistent hostility to England. He regarded it as opposed to the highest interests of France and the Empire. To make a satisfactory peace with the Court of St. James's would relieve France from a crushing expenditure, revive commerce, now seriously crippled through the command of the sea by its powerful enemy, put an end to the perilous plots fostered by English gold, and effectually extinguish the hopes of the reactionaries who thronged around the exiled Bourbons. Fouché had with this view cultivated every opportunity of establishing an understanding with the English Government, and he now employed several confidential agents—the financier Ouvrard being the principal—to open negotiations with the Marquis Wellesley. The transaction was betrayed to Napoleon; Ouvrard was instantly apprehended, and the Emperor hurried, flaming with anger, from the army to St. Cloud. After some threatening preliminaries a grand Council of State was held, June 3, 1810, at which Fouché was the only high dignitary who did not attend. 'What think you,' asked Napoleon abruptly, 'of a minister who, abusing his position, and without the knowledge of his sovereign, opens communications with the enemy, commences diplomatic negotiations on a basis of his own devising, and in this way compromises the policy of the State? What punishment is enjoined in our codes for such a betrayal?' The Council, filled with Fouché's adversaries, was silent. Cambacérès hesitatingly uttered a few words of extenuation. Talleyrand smiled. Napoleon took them up shortly. 'The Minister of Police is disgraced. Who is to succeed him?' Once more general silence, amidst which Talleyrand's voice was heard in a whisper to his neighbour. 'Doubtless M. Fouché has acted very wrongly, and for my part I can find a substitute for him, but only one—that is, Fouché himself.' The public despatch which informed Fouché of his dismissal and his appointment to the government of Rome was accompanied by a private

of rallied
ward with
was utter
ing to the
ly Fouché
y than his
Yet the
was under-
deservedly

to Fouché
rded it as
e Empire.
St. James's
ure, revive
and of the
ilous plots
guish the
the exiled
ated every
the English
tial agents
en negotia-
action was
prehended,
in the army
ies a grand
Fouché was
What think
ho, abusing
sovereign,
nces diplo-
d in this way
ishment is
he Council,
Cambacérés
Talleyrand
Minister of
Once more
as heard in
é has acted
ute for him,
lic despatch
ppointment
y a private

letter from the Emperor, couched in terms of almost fatherly and dignified remonstrance, in which the writer declared his confidence in the purity of Fouché's intentions and his hope that he might yet enjoy the benefit of his talents and faithful services.

The Emperor's decision once known there was not an hour to be lost, and Fouché, summoning his intimate friend Gaillard to his aid, set about the destruction of all compromising papers. Thousands of confidential communications of every description, from avowed and secret agents, in all classes of society and from all political groups, whose contents might bring ruin upon the writers and upon Fouché himself, filled the countless *dossiers* of the Quai Voltaire. When the Duc de Rovigo, Fouché's appointed successor, arrived, in no little trepidation at the reception he might meet with, he was welcomed with profuse cordiality. Fouché would be only too glad to afford him any assistance, but it would, of course, require some time to arrange the papers, and Madame Fouché would also want to leave the *hôtel* in perfect order. Rovigo gladly acquiesced in so reasonable and helpful a suggestion, and the work of destruction went on unremittingly. From time to time Gaillard pleaded for the preservation of specially interesting documents, but for four successive days packet after packet was cast into the flames.

The minister's retirement from office was followed by some stormy passages with Napoleon. As the extent of his secret and unauthorized negotiations with Lord Wellesley was more fully revealed the Emperor's irritation increased, and he peremptorily demanded the surrender of all the late Police Minister's correspondence. Fouché asserted that he had destroyed all confidential papers; that the Emperor's own letters and those of other members of the Imperial Family had been too sacred and confidential to allow of their meeting other eyes than his own; that, as no like demand had been made on his former resignation, he had not anticipated such a request. The dispute waxed hotter and hotter, and eventually, after a partial compliance, Fouché was dismissed from office and ordered to set out either for his estates in Aix or for some place in Italy within twenty-four hours.

There is a marked decline in the interest of the Fouché romance—for his entire biography is one continuous romance—from the date of his disgrace in June 1810 until his resumption of office on Napoleon's return from Elba in April 1814. Needless to say so restless a spirit, while affecting the utmost

indifference to power and declaring that he only longed for quiet and for the education of his children, busied himself with unwearied efforts to regain his place on the Quai Voltaire. He played, as usual, many parts at once, now sending Napoleon sound counsel which, if followed, might have saved the Empire, advocating liberal measures, trying to dissuade him from the expedition to Russia; now coquetting with the Comte d'Artois and promoting the return of the Bourbons; now contriving dark designs with Murat, and under strong suspicion of sharing his treachery and the consequent loss of Italy. When Napoleon retired to Elba he assumed the character of a candid friend, recommended him in an open letter to take up his abode in the United States, for in Europe he would always be to the sovereign Powers what Vesuvius is to Naples. To the Bonapartists he affected to support the proposal that the King of Rome, assisted by a powerful regency, should be acknowledged as emperor in his father's place. To the Royalists he insinuated that the rule of Louis XVIII., after eighteen years of exile, ignorant of the internal state of the country and absolutely without experience, could only be maintained through the skilful pilotage of the minister who knew how rightly to handle the general police and was in his own person the one trustworthy link to unite the Revolution, the Empire, and the Bourbon throne.

Fouché had not reached Paris when Napoleon's abdication in April 1814 opened the way for the Bourbons, nor was his name among the Provisional Government which recalled Louis XVIII. 'Les absens ont toujours tort.' He returned, however, in time to assume a leading position as Minister of State and to display his wonted fertility of resource in arranging matters of critical delicacy. His counsels of moderation fell on unheeding ears, and he quickly despaired of the monarchy when Napoleon landed in the Gulf of Juan. There are men who in times of political crises should be either in prison or in power, and Bourrienne, the recently appointed prefect of police, had orders to arrest Fouché. The ex-Police Minister was utterly astounded when his carriage was stopped on the boulevard and the warrant for his apprehension produced; but he only shrugged his shoulders, and saying, 'We do not arrest a minister or a senator in the street,' he ordered his coachman to drive to his *hôtel*. Once there, the Duc d'Otrante protested vehemently it was some gross mistake; the warrant was a forgery; it was utterly improbable that a minister should be arrested who had spent the whole night closeted with the Police Minister and the King's brother;

they had better send for the National Guard and inquire whether the King or the Comte d'Artois knew anything about it. While these inquiries were being prosecuted Fouché walked up and down, talking with the commandant Tournon, to whom the warrant had been entrusted, expressing perfect confidence in the answers which would be received from the Tuileries, and as he leaned for a moment against the door of a partition he suddenly disappeared. Tournon, suspecting no stratagem, waited a decent time, and then went in search of his host, who had sprung from a window into his garden, scaled the wall by a ladder, and disappeared. He did not emerge from his hiding-place, from whence he sent indignant protests to the Senate and to Madame de Custine, until Napoleon's arrival at the Tuileries. A few hours later he accepted for the fourth time the portfolio of the Police from the man whose forced exile he had advocated for the past eleven months and to whom he had addressed such disdainful counsel.

A hazardous escape from the most imminent peril during the Hundred Days is too characteristic of both the Emperor and his minister to be passed over. Owing to his friendly relations with the English and Austrian diplomatists Napoleon at times employed Fouché in negotiations with them, and, under cover of some public transaction, Fouché, at the request of Metternich, despatched a secret agent of his own to confer with Werner, a confidant of the Austrian Chancellor. The plot was revealed to Napoleon; Fouché's agent was arrested and confessed, and Fouché himself—as yet ignorant of what had happened—was summoned by the Emperor, but failed to say a word on the matter. Convinced of his minister's treachery, Napoleon determined to probe the matter more deeply, and sent Fleury, one of his secretaries, to meet Werner at Bâle. There the whole scheme came out. Before, however, Fleury could return Fouché was informed of what was in store for him. With the most perfect *sang-froid* he repaired on some excuse to the Tuileries, and in the course of conversation with the Emperor he observed, 'By the way, sir, I have forgotten to name to you a letter I have had from M. Metternich. I have so many important things to attend to. Besides his messenger forgot the powder to bring out the sympathetic ink, and I thought there was some mystification. Here it is, sir.' Further inquiry revealed deeper depths of treason, but Napoleon thought the season inopportune for revenge.

The hesitations and embarrassments following upon the

crushing defeat of Waterloo need not detain us, since M. Madelin avowedly borrows his account of the crisis from Thiers's well known history. The imperturbable *sang-froid* of Fouché must have been perpetually strained to the utmost. His unerring instinct told him that the restoration of Louis XVIII. was the only practicable solution of the crisis, but in his judgment it was essential that the Bourbons should neither be imposed on France by the allies nor too cordially welcomed by the nation, but should owe their acceptance to his own unique and peculiar sagacity and statecraft. Despite the alternate audacity and duplicity with which he cajoled in turn the Republican, Bonapartist, and Reactionary leaders—Carnot, La Fayette, Macdonald—despite the cool intrepidity with which he faced the rising displeasure of the Chamber and the outspoken indignation of his colleagues in the Ministry, who found themselves incessantly duped or disregarded; despite the unwearied patience with which he strove to moderate the dangerous impetuosity of the Royalists, whose interests he was yet promoting under such imminent peril—all seemed hopelessly jeopardized by the obstinacy with which the Ultra-Royalists refused the liberal concessions that Fouché urged upon them. Meanwhile the allied forces were steadily advancing towards Paris, and unless terms of capitulation could be promptly arranged the fall of the capital was inevitable. M. Madelin suggests in a few eloquent sentences the deplorable consequences which would have followed its forcible occupation, and assigns due and unstinted praise to Fouché and Davout for the timely concessions by which these inexpressible calamities were averted. 'This should be acknowledged and repeated,' he writes. 'On July 3, 1815, they saved Paris and France.'

With the confirmation of his appointment as Minister of State to the Most Christian King the fortune of Fouché reached its zenith, and in the following month (August 1815) the top stone was placed on it by his marriage with Gabrielle de Castellane, a daughter of one of the most ancient families of Provence. His biographer pauses at this point to moralize upon a career whose success seemed to defy all justice, human or divine—a career probably without parallel in the long page of history—and we crave space for a condensed recital of the long-drawn indictment M. Madelin prefers. Fouché had apostatized early in life, and though engaged in ecclesiastical duties had borne in a few months, through fear, ambition, and absolute lack of convictions, to become the most violent apostle of irreligion, persecuting his brethren,

since M.
crisis from
g-froid of
most. His
ais XVIII.
his judg-
neither be
welcomed
his own
espite the
cajoled in
leaders—
ntrepidity
Chamber
es in the
d or dis-
which he
Royalists,
imminent
obstinacy
oncessions
ied forces
terms of
he capital
eloquent
uld have
unstinted
ssions by
' This
On July 3,

Minister of
f Fouché
ust 1815)
Gabrielle
t families
moralize
ll justice,
el in the
ondensed
a prefers.
ngaged in
ugh fear,
come the
brethren,

proscribing Christian worship, profaning its altars, and abjuring its God. He had committed murder and boasted of it, while he secretly deplored it, and for twenty-one years on the plain of Les Brotteaux there had stood the huge charnel-house where were rotting the remains of two thousand Lyonese shot down by Fouché of Nantes, while the pavement of the city was still stained with blood from the scaffold which he had raised. He had voted the King's death, although a few hours before he had professed to desire his acquittal. He had preached communism and public plunder, and yet had amassed a gigantic fortune through obscure speculations and disreputable profits, and had acquired a great political position through unblushing treacheries. The servant of Barras and Sieyès, he betrayed the one on the eve and the other on the morrow of Brumaire. Laden with wealth and honours by Napoleon, he had contributed more than anyone to his final ruin, and when the son's fortune was under his charge he had been a traitor to him, as he was to his father. Yet everything had prospered with him. The clergy honoured the apostate. The Faubourg St. Germain received with open arms the murderer of the aristocracy at Nantes and Nevers, the assassin of the nobility at Lyons. The bankers and financiers of Paris looked on the communist of the Terror as their mainstay in the Ministry, and chose him as their representative. His modest fortune, all but ruined in 1793, had swelled to nearly twenty millions in 1815; he was the largest landed proprietor in France, with châteaux, *hôtels*, forests, domains, and each day was augmenting his princely estate; and, to crown all, he had just married a beautiful girl of twenty-six with the bluest blood of France in her veins, while the marriage contract was signed by the consecrated King of France, the anointed descendant of St. Louis, and the wedding was blessed with the benediction of Cardinal Maury, one of the most honoured men in the French Church, bestowed on the new couple from Rome.

And now the old story repeats itself. Fouché's fortune has culminated and long prosperity apparently is before him—credit, power, popularity, domestic happiness, royal favour. He was elected by three constituencies for the new Chamber. He had the support of the Comte d'Artois. He was deemed indispensable. Suddenly the ground beneath him collapsed. The new Chamber, filled with ultra-reactionists, would have none of him. One by one his supporters forsook him—Talleyrand among the first. Murmurs were heard that the presence of a regicide in the Council was an outrage, and D'Artois turned him the cold shoulder. Pamphlets de-

nounced in uncompromising language his earlier crimes, his most recent political infidelities, his scandalous wealth. The Duchesse d'Angoulême, whom Napoleon called the only *man* among the Bourbons, had bluntly declared she would never receive him. It is unnecessary to dilate upon the *Two Reports* whose publication formed the excuse for Fouché's dismissal. It was only a month after his marriage that his mission as ambassador to Dresden for the second time gilded the disgrace and closed the official career of Joseph Fouché. He was never to see France again. After four years of wandering in Germany and Austria he died at Trieste, fortified by the rites of the Church, on December 28, 1820. A violent snow-storm overturned the hearse that was bearing his coffin to the basilica of San Giusto, as if nature refused peaceful rest to the man who passed so agitated and tempestuous an existence.

ART. VII.—CHRISTIANITY AND HUMANISM.

Culture and Restraint. By HUGH BLACK. (London, 1901.)

To all who hold that the Christian Faith comes from God—that it is essentially Divine, alike in its significance for Thought, and in its practical serviceableness for Life—the question as to the precise relation between that Divine gift and the natural order in the midst of which it comes to us is one of surpassing interest; to Christian philosophy—at least, to Christian philosophy in that widest sense in which it aims at an interpretation of the whole of History and Existence, the whole of Being and Becoming—it is, perhaps, of central importance.

What is the relation of Christianity to secular History? What is the true relation of the Church to the World, and of the Christian ideal of Life to those other ideals which the age-long history of the world has wrought out, and which, in the present and the past alike, have been so often set forth as alternative? Is it a relation of contrast or of contradiction, or can we, in any practically significant and useful sense, hold that the Divine order is the completion and fulfilment of the natural?

In the past history of Christendom there have been many who have seen only a contrast or contradiction between the Divine economy of grace in which they had their life and the

secul
com
tion,
come
teres
Chri
rewa
place
scen
Divi
worl
the r
'oth
cry,
of C
alwa
thro
Divi
indu
her,
not
way
its a
for
apoc
dark
life
O I
own
is d
the
from
whic
a co
shor
thes
stra
in t
Chr
of t
a n
too
and
citi

secular order around them. The Christian vocation had come to them as, primarily, a call to separation—to separation, not only from the world's sin, for as such the call of God comes to each one of us, but also from its predominant interests and characteristic activities. The new life into which Christ had brought them seemed one in which the aims, the rewards, and the criteria of the world's daily business has no place. These belonged, or seemed to belong, to a passing scene of history, upon which sin had already brought the Divine condemnation. They were, characteristically, of the world, worldly, and, in sharpest contrast to them, the aims, the rewards, the criteria, of the Christian life seemed wholly 'other-worldly.' To believers such as these the old-world cry, 'Come out of her, my people!' seemed the present call of God to the present world, and they followed it, if not always literally into desert places apart from the world's thronging life, at least into spiritual solitudes which only the Divine Presence made habitable, and into which the world's industry and policy could find no entrance. 'Come out of her, my people!' Yes! Yes! But the world remained, if not with them, at least around them, obstructing their pilgrimage with snare and hindrance, pressing in upon them with its adverse practice, and conflicting ideals, with its claims for an allegiance other than theirs. What wonder if the apocalyptic war in Heaven between the hosts of light and darkness seemed prophetically descriptive of the Church's life on earth? What wonder if men found in 'To your tents, O Israel!' the true watchword of Christian vigilance.

It is, perhaps, natural whenever men find either in their own personal experience, or in the history of the world as it is daily worked out before their eyes, extreme illustration of the moral difference between life with Christ and life apart from Him, that they should think of the Church of Christ, which is confessedly *in* the world, but not *of* it, as essentially a contrast to the world. It is quite natural, too, that they should express that contrast in terms that raise it into antithesis. Such a dualism, then—if one may put a little constraint upon a convenient word—such a dualism was natural in the first years of our era, when the fresh beauty of the Christian life first came to men, and, amid the corruption of the dying Græco-Roman world, brought them the glory of a new hope, the power of a new birth. No words then seemed too strong in which to set forth the contrast between the flesh and the spirit, between the old life and the new, between the cities of earth's dying civilization, embittered by hardness and

stained by lust, and that 'holy city, the New Jerusalem,' into which nothing can enter that 'worketh abomination or maketh a lie.' No words then seemed too strong to emphasize the difference, and, in later history, in times of religious revival, when men have seen anew the glory of Christ, and felt anew the power and the wonder of His salvation, the same difference—essentially the same difference, although otherwise illustrated—has led to the same emphasis. Apart, too, from such general visitations of the Spirit, whenever, in any individual heart that same difference is found, whenever in and to any individual experience the new life of grace stands out, and is seen to stand out, against an earlier darkness that might be felt, then, also, and quite naturally, Thought, in reflecting upon the contrast it so intimately knows, is prone to rest on the apparent antithesis as final.

It is with the broad contrast thus indicated that Mr. Black deals in the book now before us. He contrasts two ways of life—the way of self-realization, and the way of self-sacrifice—the one as characteristic of the world's secular morality, the other as distinctively Christian, and he asks, 'What is the truth concerning them?' The question 'is no academic one'—certainly not for those who are awake to the seriousness of the Christian's choice; certainly not for those who, in early years, when life is opening before them, rich in promise and attraction, are called upon to decide between the two ways. Mr. Black uses the words 'Culture' and 'Restraint,' and other words which he employs as substantially equivalent to these, to characterize the two ideals he contrasts.

According to the one view,

'the purpose of life is that we should come into the full realization of our powers; and this is to be achieved, not by limitation, but by expansion, by obeying our nature fearlessly. It carries with it the sacred duty to develop all the faculties, to train the mind, to attempt to reach a complete and well-balanced state of existence, to become all that it is possible for each individual to become' (p. 4).

How sharply contrasted, in Mr. Black's view, is the other ideal, 'the other extreme,' we may gather from the following passage:

'It glorifies self-denial, and points resolutely to a strait gate and a narrow way, and does not hesitate to denounce as self-indulgence the aim of culture, to perfect the nature by the varied channels which the world affords. Only in sacrifice is life perfected. It speaks of restraint, denying oneself, and giving up, cutting off a right hand, and plucking out a right eye. In the passion of sacrifice it seems

1902

to
nat
pow
the
med
voic
the
chee
tam

limi

tive
non
cha
simtha
and
ind
tha
of t
we
of
denpre
pramea
nec
ren
org
the
(ppus
ans
life
Bl
not
diff
diff

to make the ideal an emasculated life, anæmic, impoverishing the nature, cutting off the sources of joy, reducing the scope of the powers, and narrowing down the whole horizon. It is the way of the cross, and to the eye of culture it looks like madness, ever meddling with the free play of human instincts, ever silencing the voice of nature, leaving a poor mutilated life. Not "Be yourself" is the watchword, but Give up, go without, renounce the natural, put a check upon the normal and spontaneous outflow of vital energies, tame and subdue the high heart of man' (p. 7).

Out of this contrast arises a fundamental question.

'Should a man obey his nature or thwart it, seek self-limitation or self-expansion?' (p. ix.).

To this, notwithstanding the fact that one of these alternative ideals seems to him to be distinctively characteristic of non-Christian thought, while the other is historically just as characteristically at home in the Church, Mr. Black finds no simple or evident answer.

On the one hand he finds himself compelled to recognize that the 'instinct which seeks self-expression is innate to us,' and that 'no theory, economic or religious, can destroy the individualism of man' (p. 3). On the other hand he finds that the ideal of self-restraint has often led men into extremes of ascetic renunciation with which it is impossible for any of the modern world wholly to sympathize, extremes in which we find 'religion depreciating things which are the very glory of the race, in the strange thought of honouring God by denying some of God's gifts to men' (p. 3).

Once more, the question is not an academic one. It is pre-eminently practical, concerning as it directly does, our practical attitude towards the daily life around us.

'If we mean to follow Christ and do His will, what does that mean as to our relation to the common pursuits and human connections? Must we in any sense cut adrift from them and even renounce the natural bonds which unite us to the general social organism of our day? Is renunciation the keynote of the faith, and the accredited method of entering into the fullest Christian life?' (pp. x-xi).

'Must we . . . renounce the natural bonds which unite us to the general social organism of our day?' Upon our answer to this will depend not only our practical course in life, but also our philosophy of history. The question Mr. Black formulates, although immediately a practical one, is not exclusively practical. We have before us, not merely different ways of life, but different views of the world—different *Weltanschauungen*—and our answer, whatever it

be, will therefore have wide-reaching consequences and implications for thought as well as for life.

By a simple comparison of the two conceptions of life, Mr. Black is unable to find grounds for a decisive choice between them. It is easy to decide between Pleasure and Duty, Right and Wrong, Selfishness and Unselfishness. Our choice is made—at least, our theoretical choice is made—as soon as the contrast is stated. But between Culture and Restraint we can make no such immediate decision. Here, the contrast, although on the surface marked enough, does not lead us to any immediate choice. There is something to be said for each. Each appears to contain an element of truth. There are facts on each side of the contrast—facts that cannot be disputed, facts that cannot be ignored. Neither view can be wholly rejected. We must endeavour to take both conceptions up into some higher thought that shall do justice to the truth in each.

Mr. Black identifies his conflicting ideals with the contrasted temperaments which—following, we presume, Mr. Matthew Arnold—he calls respectively the Hellenic and the Hebraic, and his opening chapter touches upon the warfare of these ideals in Maccabean and post-Maccabean Jewry. 'Thy sons, O Zion, against thy sons, O Greece.'¹ Mr. Black does not, however, suggest that the conflict of these ideals is only a chapter in ancient history. Far from it. His names indicate a spirit; they are not intended to enforce or suggest national limitations. For him the Palestinian conflict was but one phase of a warfare that has not yet ceased. For him Western Europe during the Renaissance, and England during the seventeenth century, were scenes of spiritual struggles strictly comparable with those of the earlier time, and as, for him, Savonarola and the English Puritans were spiritual successors of the Pharisees, so the Humanists and Cavaliers stood in the Hellenistic line of the Sadducees.

The following passages show how Mr. Black conceives of the original contrast which furnishes him with his historical names:—

'Not self-sacrifice but self-realization, was the highest word of Greek thought. Every natural impulse was justified and had the sanction of religion, and even had a special deity assigned to it. The highest human aim came to be the cultivation of the natural, the beautiful, the graceful, in the world and human life, the due balance and harmony of all the powers and capacities of man, the fulfilment of the whole nature, the development of all sides of life (pp. 16-17).

¹ Zechariah ix. 13.

'Pagan religion was nature-worship, the worship of what is, not the vision of the glory and holiness of God, which drove the Jews to their knees. . . .

'The contrast can be worked out in detail on many lines, but it is evident how the two ideals differ and how it is true that Zion must be against Greece. The one stood for Religion and the beauty of holiness; the other for Culture and the love of beauty. The one was sensitive to the moral purity of God and therefore to the moral sanctions of life; the other was sensitive to æsthetic beauty and therefore to the natural glory of life. Hebraism adored and glorified God; Hellenism deified the world and glorified man. . . . Hebraism, therefore, stands to us for moral discipline; Hellenism for the culture of the human, the sensitive love of the beautiful and the joy of living' (p. 17).

In later times, when the Hebraic spirit, working itself out under the new conditions of Christian faith and practice, had issued in asceticism, the contrast appeared yet more marked. Compared with 'Hellenism'—simple and natural and joyous, a sort of victorious possession of the world—'Hebraism' wore a sadly unattractive guise—'uneasily, renouncing joy, and creeping out of the great experiences of life' (p. 326).

The following well-known passage, which is quoted by Mr. Black (p. 326), well illustrates the contrast between the full-blooded humanism of the Greeks and some, at least, of the ascetic ideals that grew up under the shadow of 'the Cross.'

'They were standing before the Apollo in the Belvidere gardens. Inglesant took from beneath his vest a crucifix in ivory, exquisitely carved, and held it beside the statue of the god. The one, the noblest product of buoyant life, the proudest perfection of harmonious form, purified from all the dross of humanity, the head worthy of the god of day and of the lyre, of healing and of help; the other worn and emaciated, helpless, dying, apparently without power, forgotten by the world.'¹

No wonder if to many in those days the message of the Cross seemed foolishness. But such it must have seemed to the Greeks even at first, before its bearers had learned the extreme vocabulary of asceticism—so marked, says Mr. Black, 'are the contrasts between the way of culture and the way of restraint, so wide the differences between the temperaments to which they severally appeal.

'The cross, and the message of the cross, might be a stumbling-block to the Jews, with their glowing hopes of a Messianic King; but St. Paul knew well that to the Greeks the cross could only be

¹ *John Inglesant*, chap. xxv.

foolishness, with their keen zest of life, their pride of knowledge, their love of the beautiful in nature, their whole conception of morality as the harmonious development of the powers existing in man' (p. 16).

What, then, shall we say to these two ideals? Are they ultimate forms of moral aspiration, or is there some more complete ideal which embodies the truth of each? We have already seen how Mr. Black contrasts them, but, as we have also seen, the simple contrast leaves this question undecided. To answer it effectually, we must study them more carefully. Let us take the ideal of self-culture first.

We must begin by making an important distinction—the distinction between mere Humanism and Self-realization in the narrower and higher sense. In a certain sense, we can say that all ideals of self-culture are humanistic, that self-culture always means self-realization. In so far as self-culture means the development—the cultivation—of human life, and of the powers and aptitudes of human life, it is always humanistic, and in the same degree, and for the same reasons, it always means self-realization. But what is the self that culture seems to realize? What is the ultimate nature of that human life which culture essays to develop and cultivate? To this question two widely different answers may be given—historically have often been given. It may be said, it has, in effect, been often said, that the 'soul' is *merely* a form of experience, *merely* the almost momentary unity of passing psychical states—an ever-changing focus around which the ever-changing contents of experience group themselves. If this be so, human life is merely a play of incident across an ever-shifting scene, and we find ourselves within measurable distance, perhaps actually across the borders, of mere phenomenalism—of that nihilistic analysis which reduces the world of men and things to 'a dream, without a dreamer.' On the other hand, we may say that the 'self' is an abiding spiritual principle in each individual, with powers, aims, and implicit ideals that become developed only in and through experience, that individual history is the record of this growth, and that in this growth we have self-realization.

If we accept the former view, self-culture can mean only *mere* Humanism. If the latter, it will mean a form of self-realization which is quite capable of being set forth in noble and attractive guise.

Mr. Black does not draw the distinction here made,¹ but

¹ Mr. Black, indeed, nowhere discusses, or even consciously approaches, the philosophical questions suggested by his theme. This is, perhaps, the radical defect in his interesting and suggestive book.

his su
the E
quote
well

H

'T

with s
of a c
that li
swift
break
gain t
perien
attrac
the q
to pas
be pro
forces
gem-l

I

here
that
form
the C
alter
lives,
is, of
tiani
the c
cally
ethic
Chris
cepti
Chris
ultim
very
and
flict,
abidi
which

M
tion o
'the r
'truly
equal
fact, t
Huma

his summary of Walter Pater's 'New Hellenism' in *Marius the Epicurean*, and yet more strikingly, a passage which he quotes from the last chapter of the same writer's *Renaissance*, well illustrate the lower form of Humanism.

Here is Mr. Black's summary :

'To him our physical life is a perpetual motion of impressions with some exquisite intervals, and the inward world of mind consists of a drift of momentary acts of sight and passion and thought, so that life is like a flame eagerly being devoured, or like the race of a swift stream on which a tremulous wisp forms and reforms itself as it breaks into consciousness. . . . The true purpose of life is not to gain the fruits of experience to be stored up in character, but experience itself is the only and sufficient end, to attain to some attractive mood of passion, or insight, or intellectual excitement. In the quick pulsation of this evanescent life, the great aim should be to pass more swiftly from point to point, and if possible contrive to be present always at the focus where the greatest number of vital forces unite in their purest energy. To burn always with this hard gem-like flame, to maintain this ecstasy, is success in life' (pp. 64-5).

It is not, however, with this lower Humanism that we are here and now primarily concerned ; nor, perhaps, is it in this that Mr. Black is primarily interested, for it is not in this form that Humanism comes into *direct* ethical conflict with the Christian ideal, it is not in this form that it offers an alternative to those who, in the practical ordering of their lives, are hesitating between 'Christ and other masters.' It is, of course, true, that between such Humanism and Christianity there is an unceasing conflict—and, equally of course, the conflict is ethical, but it is not *directly* and characteristically ethical, fought out on ethical ground, and decided by ethical issues. The difference between such Humanism and Christianity is wider than a simple difference of ethical conception, and no one wavers between such Humanism and Christianity for reasons that are simply and only ethical. The ultimate differences are philosophical. They go down to the very roots of our thinking about the world and about man, and it is upon these philosophical questions that, in *this* conflict, the main issue has to be fought out. Is there, indeed, an abiding spirit in man, or is there not? This is one form in which those ultimate philosophical differences appear. If

Mr. Black rightly opposes to Mr. Pater's ethical nihilism the conception of spiritual permanence. But he refers this conception directly to 'the religious man,' and he gives no hint that, although this thought is truly characteristic of religion—at least of our Christian religion—it is equally characteristic of the higher Humanism of self-realization—is, in fact, the very note which distinguishes the higher doctrine from the lower Humanism he is directly criticising.

there is *not*, the ethic of the lower Humanism follows as a matter of course. If there *be*, that ethic makes no appeal—it is out of court.

But the affirmative answer to this preliminary question about the ultimate nature of man, although decisive against the lower Humanism, says nothing against the higher—against the doctrine of Self-realization in its narrower and nobler sense. Indeed, not until this affirmative answer has been admitted, can the higher ethic of Humanism be logically put forward as an available alternative to the Christian morality of Restraint. That higher ethic rests, as we have seen, upon the conception of the soul as an abiding entity—an indwelling spiritual principle, which has to achieve manhood, to develop its powers, and build up its character, in and through experience. Owing to Mr. Black's failure to distinguish between the two broadly contrasted forms of Humanism, it is not easy to find in his book any passages in which the idea of the higher Humanism is at all clearly set forth. He often speaks of self-realization. Culture, he tells us, in a passage already quoted—'Culture declares that the purpose of life is that we should come into the full realization of our powers' (p. 4). 'It emphasizes the duty which a man owes to himself to be what it is in him to become' (p. 33). 'It carries with it the sacred duty to develop all the faculties, to train the mind, to attempt to reach a complete and well-balanced state of existence, to become all that it is possible for each individual to become' (p. 4). 'All that it is possible for each individual to become.' This all-inclusiveness of aim frequently appears in Mr. Black's references to Culture and Self-realization. Culture, we have just seen, 'carries with it the sacred duty to develop *all* the faculties' (p. 4). Nay, Mr. Black apparently thinks that this universality of 'humane' endeavour is incumbent upon us as a duty without reference to any particular ethical theory. Culture does not *make* the duty—the duty, which every man owes to himself . . . to use all means to attain a full development of all his powers' (p. 33)—it does but emphasize it. But in so far as the effort after Self-realization is thus indiscriminating, it does not differ in ethical value from that 'new Hellenism' of Walter Pater, which Mr. Black so entirely repudiates, and the completely formulated doctrine of it would seem to differ from that of the lower Humanism only in the metaphysical point that, as against the negations of the latter, it recognizes the real existence of the soul. But this recognition, in and by itself, is ethically valueless.

The true ideal of the higher Self-realization is quite other

than
simi
did
larg
fund
is 't
The
fact-
vario
capa
whic
high
I
whic
lowe
effect
E
(
provi
ceptil
for ac
unhap
arbitr
positi
denn
exper
appro

L
'In c
huma
rival
repre
his e
cultu
direct
both
T
'that
into
of ho
the e
173-

VO

than this. It is essentially discriminating, and bids us, not simply to be all that we can be, but to be our best. If it did not, the conception of self-sacrifice would not enter so largely into it, as we shall presently see that it does. The fundamental law of the moral life, says Professor Mackenzie, is 'the commandment that bids us realize the rational self.'¹ The '*rational self*'—not the self as a mere empirically given fact—an aggregate, or little more than an aggregate, of variously developed and quite unorganized and undisciplined capacities and desires—but the self in that ideal completeness which can vindicate itself to thought—it is *this self* that the higher Humanism bids us realize.

Here, then, we have a principle of moral discrimination which effectually distinguishes between the higher and the lower self, and which, therefore, places the higher Humanism effectively beyond the range of much of Mr. Black's criticism.

But Mr. Black by no means recognizes this:

'It may be asserted that a complete scheme of culture would provide moral and spiritual training, and would make a man susceptible to all noble influences, and would, in any moral crisis, call for adherence to the good, even though it promise to bring only unhappiness; but this, after all, is imported into the theory and is an arbitrary standard, and does not naturally spring out of the original position. From the premises stated we are not justified in condemning another because he chooses for himself a lower type of experience, and a grosser form of pleasure than we perhaps would approve for ourselves' (p. 63).

Let us now turn to the contrasted ideal of Restraint. 'In opposition to the theory of the natural cultivation of all human powers, the world has ever had presented to it the rival theory, which works by a rigorous method of self-repression' (p. 154). With these words Mr. Black commences his examination of 'the rival method which opposes self-culture by self-restraint' (p. 153), and they naturally lead him directly to a criticism of ascetic theory and practice. Upon both his judgment is severe, although not unqualified.

The eternal truth of asceticism, says Mr. Black, is this, 'that a man has to master himself; has to bring his being into subjection to the laws of health, and to the higher laws of holiness; that discipline is needed in every sphere; that the energies and appetites must be subdued and ruled' (pp. 173-4). That being so, it is not surprising that it soon

¹ *A Manual of Ethics*, Prof. J. S. Mackenzie, 3rd edit. p. 323.
VOL. LIII.—NO. CVI.

appeared in the Church as a protest and reaction against the surrounding corruption of the Græco-Roman decadence.

'When we think of the whole situation of men, who were set to keep themselves unspotted from evil, we are not surprised to find early in the history of the Church ascetic exercises creeping in, due chiefly to the necessary protest against the terrible evils of pagan life' (p. 195).

'A protest in the name of the soul was bound to be made' (p. 193), and the Christian protest not unnaturally passed into asceticism. Now, concerning this, as we have said, Mr. Black's judgment is severe, but it is not indiscriminating.

The ascetic scheme, he tells us,

'is not just a form of insanity, a blind fanaticism with no solid groundwork of fact. It springs from facts and forces which have their ultimate seat in the nature of man. It may overstep the work of the necessary discipline required to keep the body in subjection, but it at least honours human nature by demanding the ascendancy of the higher instincts over the lower. The heart of man has ever acknowledged the grandeur of this view, inspired as it is with a deep sense of the solemnity of human life. Even the monastic system, which is so much discredited in modern thought, was a noble attempt on a magnificent scale to purify the flesh of its grossness, and to lift life to a higher level' (p. 157).

Concerning the Golden Age of Monasticism, indeed, Mr. Black writes a frank eulogy:

'We cannot do anything like historic justice to the monastic system also without admitting the practical good it achieved on various lines throughout the centuries that followed. The monasteries in their pure state were always schools of labour, in which the day was divided into work and prayer. They were also schools of charity, for the poor who lived within reach, for travellers and pilgrims passing through. It cannot be forgotten, also, that in some periods of European history they served a useful part in mitigating the distresses of the time as a refuge for the oppressed. Amid the wars and conquests of the Middle Ages they remained inviolate among the wildest violence, on account of the sanctity attached to the character of the inmates, or to the place itself. They were humanizing centres, as they had been in pagan or semi-pagan, so also in nominally Christian countries, convincing men of the sincerity of the religious by the self-denial they practised' (pp. 203-4).

Yet our author's final judgment is adverse—on certain points strongly adverse:

'The ascetic ideal taken by itself results in failure, even more disastrous than the failure of the theory of self-culture, for the latter at least aims at a positive end, while the former spends its strength on a merely negative method' (p. 222, foot-note).

tion
mis
is.
deg

asc
ma
of a
orig
thr
sep
pri
did
out
for
asc
is M
his
he
he

'ha
but
that
spir
exte
viti
evil
nex

nat
Chr
res
ans
he
ther
tion
wor
idea

deve

1
men
2
not
the

According to Mr. Black it is no unimportant misconception that leads to the practical failure of asceticism. The mischief is radical. 'The deepest idea at the root of asceticism is . . . the radically false conception of human nature, as a soul degraded by being imprisoned in sinful matter'¹ (p. 243).

On another page he writes: 'The deepest thought on all ascetic practice is that sin is due to matter or to the body of man' (p. 208). He definitely refers (208) 'the root conception of asceticism' to 'the Oriental answer to the problem of the origin of evil.' This answer, he tells us, influenced the Church through the Gnostic dualism which, he says (pp. 208-9), separated God from the world and represented the one as the principle of good, the other as the evil principle. The Church did not come out of the long struggle with Gnosticism 'without marks of conflict.' The victor was affected for good and for evil; and one of the effects for good and for evil was the ascetic bent given to the Christian life' (p. 212).² This, then, is Mr. Black's interpretation of history. Let us now turn to his more particular criticism of the ascetic ideal. Asceticism, he tells us,

'has its origin in facts, the fact of sin, and the duty of self-control; but it takes a materialistic conception of both of these facts. It sees that sin is the ruin of man, but it looks on sin as not essentially a spiritual evil. It sees the need of self-control, but it seeks this by external means, by methods of repression. The false diagnosis vitiates the method of cure. It confuses sin with sense, attributes evil to the animal desires, and naturally proceeds to reduce the connexion with sense' (p. 243).

'To reduce the connexion with sense.' This would naturally lead to exaggerated forms of self-sacrifice; and in Christian asceticism Mr. Black finds that these have, in fact, resulted. According to him the more extreme ascetics answered with an unqualified affirmative the question which he suggests in his introductory pages: 'Should not the ideal then be, whether we can realize it or not, rigorous mortification, even complete withdrawal from the entanglements of the world?' (p. xi). How, then, did they proceed to realize their ideal of separation from the world?

'The method insisted on, as can be seen from any book of ascetic devotion, is, Deny yourself every satisfaction, deny the eyes delight

¹ A student of the Neo-Platonists could write an interesting comment on this.

² But why does Mr. Black make mention only of Gnosticism? Had not Neo-Platonism also an ascetic influence on the life and thought of the Early Church?

of seeing, the tongue the pleasure of speech, the palate what it likes, the ears the music of man and the song of birds, the body all ease and comfort; and the more complete this denial is, the more meritorious is the exercise, and the more pleasing the sacrifice is to God' (p. 224).

There is, Mr. Black feels, at least a half-truth in this, but that very half-truth in it

'makes its inherent falseness the more dangerous. A religious man must deny himself many things of ear and eye and tongue. He must often renounce pleasure; and all this is true, even to men who have no religious ideal, but who, like the self-contained culturists, have any high purpose at all. We do not need to be told the duty and obligation of self-denial by any anchorite of old, or by the weak devotionalists of to-day,¹ who echo faintly the anchorites' creed without the courage to follow their practice. It comes to every earnest man, and certainly it comes with forceful insistence to every sincere Christian soul, who knows that he must bend to a cross if he would follow his Master. He knows that he must give up if he would be true to himself as well as true to Him. But even where self-mortification may seem to be most necessary, it must never be for its own sake' (pp. 224-5).²

Mr. Black is no Epicurean 'of the baser sort.' He knows that self-denial 'must always have a place in the Christian life, if need be to the cutting off a hand and plucking out an eye' (p. 347); but, he contends, and contends rightly, that 'to look upon mortification as in itself a virtue is a perversion of our Lord's Gospel' (p. 347).

For this conception of self-sacrifice as disciplinary, as ancillary to spiritual progress, as finding its justification in a consequent strengthening and development of character, and in that alone, Mr. Black claims the direct sanction of our Lord Himself:

'That the Christian life demands self-denial Jesus taught distinctly. If the will is to be sanctified and submitted to God, there must be strenuous self-control and sleepless discipline. He demanded from His disciples the willingness to renounce personal gratification, and, if need be, for the Gospel's sake give up everything, even life itself; but that is not a general system of renunciation as a religious method, such as asceticism means' (p. 347).

'Christ's teaching, even in the passages which seem most an

¹ To whom does Mr. Black here refer?

² It is quite true that this element has existed in Christianity, but it never has been the teaching of the Church. The sacramental system is sufficient evidence that the Church never countenanced Manichaeism. And the great writers (such as Thomas Aquinas) who defend the monastic, ascetic, or celibate life do so, not because it violates nature, but because it makes man freer to live with Christ, *i.e.* attain the completeness of nature.

encouragement to asceticism, is that it is better to pluck out an eye or to cut off a hand than to allow the whole body to perish, that it is therefore for the sake of the larger and higher life' (p. 226).

'In all Christ's teaching on self-denial it must never be forgotten that it always meant to Him some larger good. Self-repression was always a stage to a truer self-expression; any giving up of self would result in the true finding of self. Thus some common statements of the method of Christ are so one-sided as to make them caricatures of His method; for they leave out of account the great positive end. The end is not a broken, wounded life, but fulness of life, true life for the first time, so large and full that it can be called even here eternal life. It is not the process which is to be judged, but the object achieved. To say that religion means shrinkage and the attenuation of life, is to consider a few peddling details and to be blind to the result' (p. 359).

To whatever unwise and mistaken extremes the ascetics may at times have carried the idea and the practice of self-denial, the fact remains that self-denial is inevitable in life, and that, in the world as we have it, the discipline of self-denial is essential for any high and worthy achievement in manhood.

Now, concerning the reality of the self-denial that marks every worthy endeavour after worthy manhood, and concerning the moral value of self-denial as a discipline, Mr. Black has, of course, no doubt.

'The way to life is ever a narrow way. Sincere self-denial is an essential element of a noble life, without even taking into account the sacrifices for the sake of others which come to every man. To choose the better part means turning away from the other ways that please the carnal mind. There are desires, passions, tempers, that must be fought, temptations to be overcome. Not without watching and prayer and struggle can the soul shake itself free from earthly clogs and liberate itself from evil. Only by patient endurance can a man win his soul. It is the man who knows himself best, who knows how he must keep his foot on himself, in things that no one else imagines, perhaps in some sting of self-interest, some secret thought, some wounded pride, some selfishness. Every life has its own battlefield, where the lower wars against the higher. In that warfare men are trained in character; for only through discipline is true virtue possible' (pp. 174-5).

Self-denial, as Mr. Black has already told us, 'must always have a place in the Christian life, if need be to the cutting off a hand and plucking out an eye' (p. 347). But the life of Culture, of Self-realization, what of that? Have we not here, in this matter of self-denial, a vital breach between the two conceptions of life? What concord can there possibly be, either in thought or in life, between Self-realization and

Self-denial? At first sight, one might be disposed to regard them as mutually exclusive, and certainly it would not be difficult to find representations of the life of Culture in which self-sacrifice has no part. The direct appeal of Culture is æsthetic. It speaks to us of the beauty of life, of the full beauty of life, a beauty which knows no shadow of loss. And Self-realization appeals to our sense of manhood and suggests fulness of achievement, and the joy of life that comes with success. If we seek for this in formal definitions, we find the following ready to our hand in a journal of philosophical repute:

'And self-realization may be best defined as the cultivation of character, as the formation of a rich, noble, and harmonious personality; or, again, speaking in terms of function, it means a life full of rich, noble, and harmonious activities.'¹

What place is there for self-sacrifice here? The word 'noble' might perhaps afford it shelter, but 'rich' and 'harmonious' surely exclude it?

Yet no fact in the history of ethical thought is more evident or more certain than this, that the higher Humanism frankly admits self-sacrifice with its conception of the good life, and frankly recognises the discipline of self-denial.

Mr. Black uses the word 'Culture' in preference to either 'Humanism' or 'Self-realization,' unfortunately, as we are inclined to think, because of its wide and loose connotations and its undue æsthetic bias. In more places than one, and in more ways than one, these defects adversely affect his work; but despite the dangerously close relevancy of the second defect to the point we are now discussing, upon that point Mr. Black is perfectly clear. Culture, he says,

'if it is to be more than an easy acceptance of the natural, must to some extent make use of restraint to achieve its end. Sacrifice is essential for a well-balanced character and life. The scholar must make some sacrifice of bodily health, or at least of bodily pleasure, if only to give him time to study. It is recognised to be justifiable to give up pleasure of sense in the interests of intellectual good, to "scorn delights and live laborious days" that truth may be reached. It can be even seen to be noble and right to make some sacrifice of mental culture for a larger spiritual good. Sacrifice there must be, since nothing can be got without it; and the ideal of culture would be a dead letter without the upward striving. When the lower in any sphere is given up for the higher, we commend the sacrifice, and feel that it is amply justified' (p. 223).

¹ 'Self-Realization as a Working Moral Principle,' Henry Sturt. *International Journal of Ethics*, April 1898.

So true is it that self-sacrifice is at home in all the world's nobler morality, that Dr. Bernard Bosanquet, himself a distinguished representative of the distinctively modern movement in ethics, is able to say, without any reservation,

'In all the different kinds of lives which are apt to be taken as types of conflicting moral ideals, self-affirmation and self-renunciation play in principle precisely the same part. In every case there is an immediate self to educate and to subdue; and it is impossible to say, as a matter of principle, that more of this self is negated in one case than in another.'¹

With writers belonging to the modern school of ethical self-realization, self-sacrifice often indicates the transition from individual to social good.

Many literary men, most notably Mr. John Morley, have insisted strongly upon the need of public interests as a corrective to the one-sidedness of purely academic culture. Partly for ethical reasons and partly for philosophical reasons connected with their distinctive view of the nature of the soul, and the very meaning of self-realization, our modern philosophical Humanists—the men who carry on the sane and healthy tradition of T. H. Green²—are equally strenuous in their demand for social service. This demand has become characteristic of their school. Social service, says Dr. Bosanquet, 'is pretty constantly the ideal case both of self-culture (in the best sense—the cultivation of strength, breadth, and character) and of self-satisfaction.'³

Professor Mackenzie tells us that self-sacrifice 'is self-realization, but it is self-realization for the sake of the whole.'⁴ He continues:

'We can realize the true self only by realizing social ends. In order to do this we must negate the merely individual self, which . . . is not the true self. We must realize ourselves by sacrificing ourselves.'

Quite in the same spirit Mr. Muirhead⁵ says: 'The end which is the standard of moral judgment is a social one, the

¹ *Recent Criticism of Green's Ethics*. A paper read before the Aristotelian Society (London) on December 2, 1901.

² 'This is the point of view which T. H. Green did so much to impose upon our generation. A life of social devotion, of service in the spheres of the family, the parish or city, and the state, is really a life of self-realization of the truest and highest kind.' 'Self-Realization as a Working Moral Principle,' Henry Sturt. *International Journal of Ethics*, April 1898.

³ *Recent Criticism of Green's Ethics*. A paper read before the Aristotelian Society (London) on December 2, 1901.

⁴ *A Manual of Ethics*, 3rd edition, p. 276.

⁵ *The Elements of Ethics*, pp. 159-160, 233.

good is common good,' and, further, 'the interpreter and administrator of this ideal standard is the social reformer, with his brother, the martyr for social causes.'

This conception of social service is equally prominent in Mr. Black's account of the Christian life. The Christian salvation, he tells us,

'is social as well as individual; it could not really be the one without the other also. Our Lord's purpose was to found a kingdom of souls working out to social ends, a kingdom of men and women living in loving relation to each other through their loving relation to God. The Christian faith in God carries with it as an inevitable consequence the service of man' (p. 367).

What now has become of the broad contrast with which Mr. Black started? The truth of the ascetic doctrine of mortification has passed over into the Christian doctrine of self-sacrifice. The ethical Nihilism or atomism of the lower Humanism has been left behind, and the higher Humanism—the higher doctrine of Self-realization—has been shown to include conceptions of self-sacrifice and of social service which admit of easy translation into Christian speech. It is this higher Humanism which divides with Christianity the empire over the best life in the modern world. At first, when we commenced our inquiry, it was the difference between the two ideas that seemed most conspicuous; but now, when our conclusion is in sight, it is the points of agreement that appear most prominent. The way seems open for a final reconciliation.

Of course, if it could be maintained that in the contrast between Culture and Restraint—if we continue to use Mr. Black's original designations—we really have a radical difference between motives, the approximation just indicated would, after all, be of only secondary value; for, between Self-Culture and Self-Restraint as consciously proposed ends of action, the difference amounts to contradiction. It is almost the same as the difference between Selfishness and Unselfishness, and between these no approximation could be more than apparent or ethically unimportant. But in that contrast have we such a difference? Probably not. We need not be concerned to press the verbal criticism that only a desire can be a motive, and that Self-Culture and Self-Restraint, as such, are not desires. We have to go deeper, and to ask—Are Self-Culture and Self-Restraint, in themselves and directly, terms of desire, so that desire for one or the other of them can operate as a motive? Now, so far as Self-Restraint is concerned, the answer must be distinctly

negative. No man desires self-sacrifice as such, in itself and for its own sake. Whenever it appears to be desired, it is only a means to some further end, be that end either the supposed will of God or some governing ideal of human life and character. This point is forcibly and clearly brought out by Mr. Black in his criticism of the ascetic movement, and it is entirely true. Just as truly, although perhaps somewhat more technically, we may say that self-realization cannot be an object of desire. At first sight, no doubt, it seems as though it could be; but this is only because we do not at once distinguish between the self which seeks its realization in life and the intrinsic character of the life in which self-realization is sought. It is this latter that is the true object of desire in the life of self-realization. A man following that life desires the gladness, the satisfaction, the content of this or that particular kind of life. Strictly speaking, no increase of reality can come to the self as an existing thing. It either exists or it does not. If it does not exist, it cannot realize itself. If it does exist it is already real, and nothing can add to its reality. But it may be urged that this is to attach a meaning to 'reality' which it does not distinctively bear in discussions about self-realization. The aim of self-realization, it may be said, is not to make the self real simply in an ontological sense—to perform the impossible task of giving to it entitative existence, but rather to make actual its potentialities of being and doing this and that, to develop the meaning and the character which it already implicitly possesses as an actually existing thing. True; but this unfolding of content can take place only in and through the concrete forms of life, and the motive behind the soul's dynamic out-going is desire, not for the unfolding as such—either as process or result—but for the concrete goodness of the life in and through which self-realization is sought. The soul has no explicit character, except as agent and subject in experience, and it is the felt goodness of some particular concrete form of life that urges it to seek self-realization in and through that form rather than another. For self-realization in the abstract no one cares, and the moment we speak of realization in definite forms of life and experience, in some particular ideal of character, among some particular line of work, the centre of interest is shifted from the soul to the concrete forms in which it seeks its good; and it is in *them*, and not in the mere thought of self-development, that we find the true term of desire. Even in the life of self-realization, what man consciously seeks is not himself, but some-

thing which he sets before himself as good. Even in the life of self-realization—provided it be self-realization of the higher type we are now speaking of—goodness is always disinterested.

The way to reconciliation is therefore still open, and Mr. Black takes us along it to the end. Not only do the Christian and Humanistic ideals approximate in their view of self-sacrifice and social service, but, Mr. Black tells us, they agree also in this, that they set before us, as our ultimate end, a conception of perfect manhood. Culture, he says, 'begins with accepting the Christian ideal, which aims at perfection of life' (p. 33), and thus, he adds, 'with all its incompleteness, it is in some form necessary to every man who has ideals at all' (p. 33). As to the conception of a perfect manhood, it gets its true place, he says,

'in the Christian ideal, as in the great passage where St. Paul is driving home the duties which devolve upon Christians as members of the Church, to use all the variety of gifts and graces for mutual edification in the forbearance and tactful spirit of love. The purpose of the varied working, the ideal end, is that all together should come into a perfect man. He points to the progressive attainment of an ideal. The master-thought of the passage is *growth*, growth in faith and knowledge and love, not only increase in the amount of these, but improvement in the quality of them, the deepening and enrichment of their meaning and scope to each' (pp. 133-4).

Let us, then, now turn to Mr. Black's account of the 'Christian solution.' We can endorse most heartily and unreservedly Mr. Black's presentation of the all-inclusiveness of the Christian life, and of the generous fullness of the self-realization which our Christian faith makes possible.

Here is a striking passage :

'The Christian religion is the progressive grasp of the whole contents of human life, taking possession of every department of thought and activity, conquering and assimilating all forms of human development. Historically it took the philosophy of Greece and absorbed it, and gave it a new lease of power because it put it on a permanent basis. It took the imperialism of Rome and directed it into a new sphere when Roman power was crumbling away. It took the humanism of the Renaissance and gave Art a new birth. It took the political and intellectual freedom of the Reformation and made them religious. It is taking the science and politics and social movements of to-day and will direct them to large and noble ends. It solved the problems of the old world and will solve our problems, because nothing human is alien to it. It is a principle of life and has its undying power in the present realization of God in the world. Its task is to make the secular life of man sacred, and to transform

the life
of the
always

and Mr.
do the
their view
tells us,
as our
ture, he
ch aims
all its
ery man
on of a

Paul is
members
r mutual
purpose
ld come
nt of an
in faith
of these,
l enrich-

of the
and un-
siveness
the self-

sole con-
thought
develop-
absorbed
n a per-
fected it
It took
It took
nd made
al move-
nds. It
problems,
life and
he world.
transform

the natural into the spiritual. It gives added worth to all human things, asserting that there is nothing common or unclean in the life of man that cannot be adorned with a new splendour' (pp. 379-380).

What, then, is the fundamental fact which makes our Christian faith veritably a present victory? It is our Christian consciousness of God, says Mr. Black—a consciousness which passes into love.

'The love of God in Christ unifies life for us and shows us the way out of difficulties as they arise if we are loyal to conscience. As love increases and faith deepens, a man comes to see God everywhere in the world which is made beautiful and sacred by His presence in all human love, which is a reflection of the divine' (p. 379).

The deepest thought in Christ's teaching and life is simple confidence in God, as seen both in the world and in human life, recognizing Him in nature and in man. This consciousness of the divine takes precedence of all else and becomes the great inspiring motive, driving the life to noble ends and at the same time putting everything into its rightful place in the large scheme' (p. 353).

As we walk in the light of this new faith we find our old difficulties vanish. We no longer think about them.

'Perfect moral health is a state in which self-consciousness is forgotten, and a man desires simply to do God's will. When a heart is motivated by the love of God, and a life is inspired by the consciousness of God's presence, the needful restraint becomes easy. The surrender of self to the will of God makes all necessary self-denial not worthy to be mentioned. In the interests of this great self-surrender some may need to practise a self-sacrifice that will look like the mutilation of life, but that is only appearance. The obligation will always rest on a Christian to give up all that is contrary to the mind of Christ, but when the heart is filled with love of good it finds no pleasure in evil. It does not mean any narrow deprivation of anything truly human, for the Christian life is inclusive, subduing all spheres that belong to man' (p. 379).

Even self-sacrifice is transfigured, and whereas aforetime it seemed to bring us only loss, we know it now to be the chalice of God's divinest gift of life.

'In the midst of outward loss, with the cutting off of earthly joys, with the shutting up of worldly prospects, with the narrowing of life all round, there has ever been to His followers an enlargement of life, a deepening and broadening of the true sources of life, and even a joyous, exulting sense of victory through Him that loved them' (pp. 357-8).

Whatever be the attractiveness of other ideals of life, we find that attractiveness made perfect in the transfiguring light

of Christ. Each of the contrasted ideals with which we started—the ideal of Culture and the ideal of Restraint—contains elements of essential value for human life. In the Christian ideal those also are made perfect.

This, then, is Mr. Black's conclusion—this his solution of the problem with which he started. Now concerning it, what shall we say? It is of course true—our Christian Faith *does* furnish a solution of that problem—but is Mr. Black's statement of the solution quite satisfactory? We think not. In the first place, Mr. Black's solution is little more than a practical one. He says, in effect, 'Follow Christ, and your difficulties will vanish.' Doubtless, but why? The problem of Culture and Restraint is not *merely* a practical one, it is also speculative, and demands a solution in which thought can rest. A practical answer may suffice against the immediate pressure of difficulty, but man cannot permanently rest in views that are merely practical. Unless the answer to doubt can be made intelligible, unless it can be shown to be reasonable, the old difficulties will one day revive, and the new speculative problem will still recall the old practical one. Certainly, we who live by faith in the Intelligible Word are bound, by our very loyalty to Christ, to vindicate Christian conceptions, not only as serviceable in daily practice, but also as true to thought.

In this inadequacy of Mr. Black's conclusion we see one result of that philosophical unpreparedness which we have already had occasion to notice.

Again, Mr. Black gives us no very clear account of the way in which, after all, the ideals of Culture and Restraint are, in fact, unified by the Christian conception of life. Certainly, most certainly, they *are* unified by that conception; but how?

We found that, according to Mr. Black, the ideal of Culture agrees with the Christian ideal in at least one important particular—in the fact that it points to an ideal of perfect manhood as the true end of human life. We passed this at the time without comment, because it is substantially true. One reservation is, however, necessary—Perfection is *not* the end of man. It is true that in Thought and in all the practical activities of life—in Art, in Policy, in our endeavour after goodness—we aspire after Perfection, but Perfection is not our practical end. In its most complete sense it is the prerogative of God alone, and in Him it results from the perfect sufficiency of His self-sufficient life—a sufficiency which nothing created shares, which nothing created can attain.

The practical ideal for man, therefore, cannot be found in the thought of Perfection. How otherwise, then, are we to think of it?

The ideal of any given nature sets forth the complete form of that nature—it embodies the truth about that nature, the full truth, the truth as God sees it. We may say that an ideal is always the perfection of the actual existence to which it relates, but unless that existence be Divine, its perfectness is not that of the Absolute Perfection. To set forth the practical ideal for man, therefore, we must know the truth about human nature. What is man and what is his vocation? These are the preliminary questions we must answer if we would reach true thought about man's ideal. Our Christian faith and thought finds in the spiritual dependence of man the essential characteristic of human nature. Not only is each individual man a spirit, but he is a dependent spirit—dependent upon God, not merely as a creature upon its Creator, but as a child upon its father; dependent upon Him, not only for mere existence, but also for the sustenance and furtherance of his life.

But this same dependent spirit of man has a real community of character with the Divine. Man has a rational and a moral nature. He longs after truth and needs to know it, and he seeks to apprehend it by his thought and by his art. He aspires after goodness, and his conception of it governs his life and shapes the pathway of his endeavour. But neither in truth nor in goodness can we rightly admit any divergence of meaning. Although relative to natures ultimately so distinct as the human nature and the Divine, in meaning they are always univocal. 'Natures ultimately so distinct;' for human nature, notwithstanding its Divine affinities, is in essential character quite other than the Divine. God is the Absolute, the Self-sufficing, and, because of the perfect fulness of His life, there is no unrealized possibility of Truth and of Goodness beyond Him and above Him. We may rightly say either that God has no ideal, or, preferably, that in Him the ideal and the actual coincide. With man we know it is far otherwise. Because of the limiting conditions of his dependent life there is a Truth beyond his completest thought, and he knows that there is; there is a most excellent and most blessed Life beyond the range of his highest possibilities of achievement, and, once more, he knows that there is. These unrealized possibilities are the term of his aspiration; for in them, and in them alone, is full completeness of life. In them and in them alone, is the

Perfect Truth which his reason and his art essay to reach, so that it may become serviceable in his daily practice and endeavour. In them, and in them alone, is that Perfect Goodness which he knows to be the Highest Good. Because this ideal completeness is actual in God, worship is natural to man when once the reality of the Divine has dawned upon him. Moreover, because in God Perfect Goodness is thus actual, He does not leave man helpless, spending his days in futile aspiration and worship. He becomes to man—according to the practical measure and purpose of human life—the sufficiency man cannot be to himself. Here we have the inmost truth of Religion, which, in its central reality, is the Divine response to human longing and to human need. But what does this Divine Ministry to man accomplish? Does it build him up into the sufficiency of the life of God, so that for him, too, all possibilities of Goodness and of Truth become actual? By no means; for this could not be unless man became as God, and to make man identical in nature with Himself is beyond the power even of the Omnipotent. There can be no such thing as the temporal development of a self-sufficient nature. The Divine Ministry comes to us that it may build us up in love. Love is the soul's response to life—to the gift of life. Truly, most truly, 'we love God, because He first loved us,' and in love comes to us that we may truly know that more abundant life which is Life indeed. Man, then, receives of the Divine sufficiency through love. God builds him up in love that he may truly live. Hence, through love, the spiritually dependent nature of man reaches its practical completeness. But the grace of God is always mediated to us, always sacramental. It comes to us through the outward order of history and through the outward duties and relations of each individual life, and according to the measure of our love is the degree of its power. Love, then, is the central and sovereign truth of human nature—not simply love for God, but a love that dominates and inspires our everyday life, and determines our attitude towards the daily reality around us, that daily reality in the midst of which the grace of God comes to us.

In the Christian conception of love, then, our nature finds its practical completion, its practicable ideal, and because Love is thus the completeness of Life, in the life of love we have the complete truth of the doctrine of Self-realization, of the doctrine that bids us essay completeness.

Love, too, finds no difficulty in self-sacrifice; for 'Love seeketh not her own.' In Love—love for 'whatsoever things

are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report'—disinterested goodness is made perfect. Although in Love we most truly realize ourselves, we do not love in order to realize ourselves. Love seeks 'first the kingdom of God and His Righteousness,' and all other things are added unto her.

There is only one point more, and that a small one. Mr. Black speaks of the Love of God as though it were a new motive in life. But is it? Indeed, properly speaking, is our human love for God a motive at all? We think not. Love is a new energy in life, confirming purpose and renewing hope; and so it adds strength to our motives, and sometimes gives a new practical direction to motives, but we do not think that it is, in itself, a motive. The criticism may appear a small one; but the point of view here indicated seems somewhat to simplify our philosophy of History and of Revelation—seems to bring out more clearly the essential nature of Religion as a Divine ministry of *life*, and the central characteristic of the Church's appointed work, which is surely this—we are speaking from the standpoint of philosophy rather than from that of theology—to enable the human spirit, by the mediated grace of God, to reach its natural completeness.

A new motive so transcendent as love for God would be—were that indeed a motive—would revolutionize life rather than fulfil it; for it would place life upon a new foundation, and reorganize it round a new centre. But although the Christian life is truly new, it is the transfiguration of the natural life, and not the radical reconstruction of it.

ART. VIII.—A WANDERING SCHOLAR OF THE RENAISSANCE.

The Epistles of Erasmus. From his Earliest Letters to his Fifty-first Year. Arranged in Order of Time. English Translations from the Early Correspondence, with a Commentary confirming the Chronological Arrangement and supplying further Biographical Matter. By FRANCIS MORGAN NICHOLS. (London, 1901.)

FROUDE, in his *Life and Letters of Erasmus*, regrets that

'the editors of his *Letters* have been unable, after all the pains they have taken with them, to fix accurately the dates at which they were written. . . . As they are now arranged they assign to him

movements contradictory, and often impossible. Sometimes a whole decade of years is dropped out or added; and, with the most patient efforts, the confusion can be but partially disentangled. Something, however, can be done to arrange them at least with an approach to correctness.'

The work under review has for its main object an attempt so to arrange the correspondence of Erasmus that, after four centuries, it may at length be read in the order in which it was written. A subsidiary purpose is to examine the accepted history of his life in the light of the new arrangement of his Letters, from which it has been principally drawn, and so at once to test the new chronology and revise the old biographies. More than seven hundred Epistles, including Dedications and Prefaces in epistolary form, are tabulated in a Chronological Register extending to the end of the year 1517; after which the dates of the Letters, although, or perhaps because, they are more numerous, are more easily ascertained.

Several letters are included which present Erasmus in a light not altogether so favourable as that of the biographies, an effect from which the writer does not shrink, and for which he deems the reader should be able to make allowance. The perennial fascination of the personality of Erasmus, so far from depending on an ideal excellence, springs rather from the elements mingled in him of strength and weakness, playing their part at a period of momentous and revolutionary changes, when to hesitate was to be lost, and when to shun the fray was less inglorious than to plunge into it and draw back. That

'He is all fault that hath no fault at all'

is a maxim most welcome to those whose faults are not few; but certain it is that, in proportion as some historical personage of heroic mould and splendid achievement compels our admiration, he may chill our sympathies. 'The low sun makes the colour.' This severer scrutiny rather enhances than lowers our interest in Erasmus; which, again, is not obscured by a tedious multiplication of details, a microscopic examination of the dust of libraries, and the labyrinthine pursuit of literary hares worth neither the having nor the hunting.

The Introduction, which deals with the chronology of the Epistles, is not inferior in interest—and more cannot be said—to the Letters, furnished with illustration and comment, that follow, so ample is the writer's grasp of the subject, so grave

and so
What
centur
one ma
and no
than to
on hav
merit
him or
his acu
in fixin
obscuri
romant

Two
to the
arose o

Fro
and in
Epistle
with h
efforts
treatise
and Po
models.
wrote a
pose of
leisure,
humour
without

preserve
quisite
of letter
able.'
early pe
his lett
aware th
he bega
books,
handwri
The nur
'I have
that two
It is ren
the only
this are

VOL.

and scholarly his method, so modest and urbane his style. What was not done in the lifetime of Erasmus, and what four centuries of students have sighed for in vain, is not by any one man, *uno ictu*, likely to be so done as to disarm criticism, and nothing could be further from the mind of the writer than to assume such an authority. He is to be congratulated on having so handled a perplexed and difficult subject as to merit the gratitude of the student, whether agreeing with him or not, for the accuracy and sweep of his information, his acute yet cautious conjecture, and his undoubted success in fixing, for the first time, many dates and elucidating many obscurities, while telling the story of a life by far more romantic in reality than the famous romance founded on it.

Two questions at the outset provoke inquiry: What led to the publication of the *Epistles*? and how the difficulty arose of fixing their dates?

From his very boyhood he seems to have had a special and instinctive attraction to this particular vein. From *Epistle 29* we learn that he had not only read but transcribed with his own hand the *Letters of St. Jerome*. His own efforts were at first merely literary exercises, and in his treatise *De Conscribendis Epistolis* he mentions Cicero, Pliny and Politian, and elsewhere *Æneas Sylvius* (Pius II.), as his models. 'As a boy,' he records, 'and also at a riper age, I wrote a vast number of letters, but scarcely any for the purpose of publication. I practised my pen, I beguiled my leisure, I made merry with my acquaintance, I indulged my humour; in fine, did nothing but exercise and amuse myself without the least expectation that friends would copy out or preserve such trifles.' Such assiduous practice had an exquisite result, of which he was not unconscious. 'As a writer of letters I may perhaps have seemed not altogether incapable.' The elegance, facility and brilliance of his style were early perceived by his contemporaries, who began to circulate his letters in manuscript. It was only when he became aware that this epistolary style might be a vein of gold that he began to collect and preserve his correspondence in letter-books, one of which, containing many passages in his own handwriting, is actually in existence in the library of Deventer. The number of his letters was enormous. In 1523 he wrote: 'I have written and still am writing such a quantity of letters that two waggons would scarcely be equal to carrying them.' It is remarkable, therefore, that the *Farrago Epistolarum* was the only collection published in his lifetime (1519); and in this are found only two epistles earlier than his thirtieth year.

The omission of dates from the letters is accounted for, as far as the year is concerned, by the custom of the time, and as to the day and month, by the peculiar circumstances of the writer, at any rate in his earliest letters. In the case of unimportant letters of no public interest, and about which there can be no mistake on the part of the receiver, the year date is constantly omitted even nowadays, and in the olden time it was the general practice to do so. The *Paston Letters* are evidence that the year is rarely given in the correspondence of that age, and when given is expressed, like Acts of Parliament, in the year of the king's reign (p. lxxvii).

With respect to Erasmus's own practice, it seems that to his earlier epistles he rarely added any date at all; and that the dates given in the later editions and absent from the original publication are clearly inserted by the editor. Moreover, the date in the early epistles, when given, rarely included the year; but when, about 1514-15, during his visits to Basel, he began to correspond with the learned of Upper Germany, and to mingle with persons who had acquired the Italian usage of dating their letters *Anno Domini*, he could not but perceive the advantages of the practice. That up to 1517, or thereabout, Erasmus habitually left his letters undated, and that the dates added by editors have been somewhat arbitrarily fixed, are facts of extreme importance to remember in the attempt to fix their true chronology. Thus, letters written during his first residence in Paris, in 1494-95, have been dated indiscriminately 1497-8-9; and again, letters evidently written within a few days of each other, the one being an answer to the other, early in 1513, are assigned, the former to 1515, and the answer to 1512 (p. lxxvii). A further difficulty has arisen from the variety of ways of reckoning the beginning of the year. In his treatise *De Conscribendis Epistolis* the public time, he explains, is denoted by such a phrase as 'in the 1500th year from the birth of Christ.' But some, he remarks, begin the year at Christmas, some on January 1, some at Easter, and some on Lady-day—'a fruitful cause of mistakes, which ought to be abolished.' Erasmus himself neither confined himself to one usage, nor invariably adopted that of the place in which he happened to be residing. It is necessary, therefore, in arranging the letters to consider not only the date of the year, but the method of computing it.

The neglect to fix any date at all, whether of day or place, so strange to modern ideas, is very noticeable, especially in the earliest letters. The letters belonging to the first thirty years of his life are generally without date; e.g.

of
date
wer
of t
wer
mes
exer
sam
case
leav
grad
as h
dista
Will
thin
Eras
day
to w
date
Nev
his v
with
Eras
what
he w
as a
whir
to re
hope
new
I
mour
of th
T
to bl
thoug
whol
been.
whet
the f
decep
deepe
his fa
mark
Eras

of the Epistles 1-41 in the Register here given, the only one dated is Ep. 21. The explanation is obvious. These letters were written during his conventual life, generally to monks of the same convent or to another of the same order, and were either handed to them by the writer himself or by a messenger; they were very often regarded merely as literary exercises; the dates of writing and delivery were almost the same, so that there could not be any mistake; and, in any case, the date was of no importance. For some time after leaving the convent he continued to omit the dates; but gradually the usefulness of adding them was forced upon him, as he moved from place to place and formed a large circle of distant correspondents. It is curious to note in Ep. 37 that William Herman, writing from the convent at Stein, while thinking it quite unnecessary to date his own letters, requests Erasmus to do so. 'Please, in future,' he writes, 'add the day on which you send out anything.' After the year 1517, to which this volume extends, the letters are more regularly dated, and when undated, do not present the same difficulty. Nevertheless, we hope the writer may be able to complete his work as at first designed by a second volume dealing with the letters of the more stormy and eventful period of Erasmus's life. The present volume takes leave of him at what may fairly be deemed the zenith of his career, when he was foremost among European scholars, was recognized as a leader of thought; before he had begun to reap the whirlwind from the wind he had sown; when he could afford to resist the blandishments of the Papal Court in the golden hopes inspired by the invitation of the King of England, a new Harry, and—'Such a Harry!'

It is not easy to exaggerate the difficulties he had surmounted; and a glance at them will help towards an estimate of the man and of the forces at work in his lifetime.

The shadow of the cloister lay across his cradle, threatened to blight his young life, haunted his early manhood, and, though yielding somewhat to the omnipotence of Rome, never wholly left him; even the Pope could not undo what had been. He was the son of a priest, born out of wedlock, whether before or after his father's ordination is uncertain; if the former, he was robbed of a father's care by a heartless deception; if the latter, there was added to his base birth the deeper stain of sacrilege. The same power that had ruined his father's life, and for the very reason that it had ruined it, marked him out also for its own. The biographers of Erasmus seem to have overlooked a very special reason

why he should have been forced into the cloister. It was not only, or mainly, because his guardians had wasted his little patrimony, or that the monks saw in him a lad of brilliant parts who would do credit to their order—the credit he might win for them was not of the kind they sought; nor was it an ordinary incident of the monastic press-gang which then, as now, fills its ranks by the compulsion, disguised or undisguised, of unwilling recruits. We think there was the special and peremptory reason that he was the son of a priest, a blot on the scutcheon of clerical celibacy, a reproach to the Church, to be hidden away from men. For, as a recent novel observes of one of its characters—Robert Orange, also the son of a priest—*The Church will have her own.* Erasmus was her own by right of sacrilege; and the arm of the Church was very long in those days. The step was disastrous to the monastic system as well as to him. Left to pursue his life in his own way, he would, we think, have troubled himself little about religious matters. He seems to have had little positive interest in, and rather to have disdained, them. But when religion blighted his career, no wonder he struck with beak and talon at the hand that had broken his wings. It is noteworthy that in all his attacks on the monks—and they were many—there is no trace of a humorous tolerance of their failings, so conspicuous in other satirists; nothing of Chaucer's keen-eyed smile, or of Rabelais's enormous laughter. The monk of romance is a wonderful creation: an omnipresent, mysterious power, the terror of princes, the almoner of the poor, an all-seeing spy, a pitiless inquisitor, a Psalm-snuffing drone, a sour shaveling, a roystering blade, a hypocrite condemned by warrant divine to a life of outward sanctity, steeped in melodramatic vices and vintages. There is no ray of light in his picture of the gloom and degradation of the conventual life; to him it meant ignorance, vice, sloth, mere animalism, roused only by any attempt to reform it, and then inflamed to savage and inexpiable fury. He dwells on the ignorance of the monks and their hatred of the light, their age-long efforts to cloister the human spirit within the scholastic theology, their *frequentes bibationes et tacenda*. If he admits theoretically that a holy life may be lived within the walls of a convent, he is careful to add that it may be equally well lived in the world without, and that the reality fell terribly short of the ideal. It is easy to imagine the despair and disgust he felt when, as a lad of seventeen, half conscious of great powers, quivering in every nerve with living force, he found himself, like a

cag
wou
deat
You
beco
class
as to
own
from
viole
addr
(Ep.

bewa
your
me,
book
whol
limits
perso
gaine
regre
adapt
sweet
an ex
deligh
it is w
domin
any ra
have

It
De C
conve
nephe
that
mend
that
hypot
lying
portar
his o
to hav
that,
treate
stock
if the

caged eagle, fast within the clutch of irrevocable vows which would presently consign him to what he regarded as a living death in a whited sepulchre. Craftily was the hook baited. Young as he was, he entered the convent with the idea of becoming a missionary of—Letters. In the study of the classical authors, prolonged far into the night, and so severe as to injure his health, in labouring to inspire others with his own ardour, he sought distraction from his grief and a refuge from the temptations that the convent walls shut in, not less violent or pernicious than those they shut out. In a letter addressed to Sasboud, probably a young brother of the order (Ep. 15, p. 54), he advises his friend as follows:

‘But I beg of you, Sasboud, dearest of my companions, to beware of so devoting yourself to this art of painting as to give up your interest in letters. You know, at any rate, what you promised me, when leaving this place, and on what condition you took the books of poetry from me—I mean, that you would dedicate yourself wholly to the study of letters. . . . If I were not prevented by the limits of time and of this letter, I could mention a great number of persons, and those of our own body, who, having seen what glory is gained by letters and what shame by ignorance, feel the deepest regret when they see, too late, that the season of youth, which is adapted to study, has slipped through their fingers. Therefore, my sweetest Sasboud, while your age is still unwasted, take the ant for an example, and exert yourself to prepare the materials which may delight and feed your age. And that you may do that more earnestly, it is worth your while, if you cannot altogether guard yourself from the dominating passions of youth (for that is almost more than human), at any rate to control and restrain them. You know what I mean: I have said enough.’

It is true that in his twentieth year he wrote an epistle, *De Contemptu Mundi*, setting forth the advantages of the conventual life, at the request of a friend who wished his two nephews to embrace it. From this it might be inferred, either that he was not strongly averse to that which he recommended, or that he was guilty of treachery more cruel than that which brought about his own captivity. The latter hypothesis may be dismissed; for, though not so ‘averse to lying’ as he claimed to be in matters he deemed unimportant, and mindful as he was of the prudence of keeping his own counsel, he never seems, when directly challenged, to have been false to his real convictions. We believe rather that, while seeming to comply with his friend’s request, he treated the matter as a literary exercise, reproducing the stock arguments in the choice Latin that was his own; and if the final chapter originally stood as it now appears, his

criticism of the monastic life, as he knew it, was more than enough to neutralize anything he had written in favour of it. 'The trouble you have escaped,' writes a brother monk, 'no one knows better than I, who am even now tossed about in the same storms. I often congratulate you, and think how happy you are to have swum out of the billows.'

For the letters that were his delight were also his deliverance; if not loosed from his fetters, at least he escaped from prison. In 1493, Henry of Bergen, Bishop of Cambrai, meditating a journey to Rome, with a view to the Cardinalate, felt the need of a secretary with a good Latin style. Erasmus's letters had spread his fame as a brilliant scholar and elegant writer, and the Bishop obtained his release from the convent at Stein, and attached him to his own household. Probably from want of money, the Bishop relinquished his design, and Erasmus was for the second time disappointed of his darling wish to visit Italy; but the tremendous boon had been granted him. He received a dispensation from residence in the convent, temporary, indeed, and for a long time liable to be withdrawn; but he never actually returned to what he regarded as a prison. He was still obliged to wear the monastic garb, but this also he discarded after a time, and at last received formal permission to exchange it for the dress of an ordinary priest.

Erasmus seems to have found the position somewhat distasteful; and the Bishop, having no special need for his services, was prevailed upon to furnish him with the means of proceeding to Paris and taking up his university residence in the College of Montaigu, probably in the year 1494. This freshman was, however, no youth just loosed from school. He was an ordained priest, about twenty-eight years of age, who had already a brilliant reputation for his scholarship. His stay was very brief; for the condition of the college, as he describes it, was wretched in the extreme. The diet was coarse, the sanitary arrangements were atrocious. A single year of residence in many cases caused blindness, madness, or leprosy. 'I know many,' he says, 'who cannot even now shake off the delicacy of health there contracted.' A significant touch is the mention of the hated cowl and gown of brown cloth which the members of the college were obliged to wear, and from which they were called '*Les pauvres Capettes de Montaigu*.'

Early in 1496 he returned to Paris, no longer as a member of a college and supported by a patron, but dependent on his own resources and free to order his life as he pleased; for the

Bish
allow
with
less
pena
seer
not
degr
a vi
desi
sick
Mon

rever
man
almo
have
mine
myse
wash
my r
attain

meth

They
below
play,
amon
Take
your
the s
reme
sleep
Let t
lost v
more
return
but a
any b

'...
We h
was.

Bishop of Cambrai seems at first to have sent a smaller allowance than Erasmus expected, and afterwards to have withdrawn it altogether, perhaps because he felt this cloisterless monk too great a responsibility. He says in the *Compendium Vitae* that he 'existed rather than studied'; but he seems to have earned fees by teaching *Rhetoric* large enough not only to maintain himself in comfort, and even in some degree of luxury, but to leave a margin, which he saved with a view to his long-cherished design of visiting Italy—a design that was frustrated by a severe illness in 1498. His sickness had the proverbial effect on a monk—or, was it the Monk? He writes to Nicholas Werner:

'I have been most grievously sick for a month and a half, most reverend Father, and do not yet see any hope of recovery. What is man's life, and with how much sorrow is it mingled? I have been almost killed by a slight fever, but one that recurs almost daily. I have now no liking for the world, and despise all those hopes of mine; I desire that life of holy rest in which I may have leisure for myself and God alone, may meditate on the Holy Scriptures and wash out with tears my former errors. This is what I turn over in my mind, and what I hope some time by your aid and counsel to attain.'

The following letters will afford a glimpse into the serious method and lighter incidents of his life in Paris:

Erasmus to Christian.

'Avoid nocturnal lucubrations and studies at unseasonable times. They exhaust the mind and seriously affect the health. The dawn, beloved of the Muses, is the fit time for study. After dinner either play, or walk, or take part in cheerful conversation. Possibly even among these amusements some time may be found for improvement. Take as much food as is required, not for your pleasure, but for your health. Before supper take a short walk, and after supper do the same. Before going to bed read something exquisite and worth remembering, of which you will be thinking when overcome by sleep, and for which you will ask yourself again when you wake. Let this maxim of Pliny always rest in your mind: All your time is lost which you do not impart to study. Remember that nothing is more fugitive than youth, which, when once it has flown away, never returns. But I am beginning to preach after promising to be nothing but a guide. Follow, sweetest Christian, the plan I have traced, or any better that you can. Farewell' (p. 110).

Erasmus to Christian.

'... "But why have you not written earlier to-day?" you will say. We have been engaged sitting at the play, and very entertaining it was. "A tragedy, you will ask, or a comedy?" Whichever you

please. Only, no masks were worn by the players; the piece was one act, the plot neither Roman nor Greek, but quite on a low level, without either music or dancing. The ground formed the stage, and my parlour the gallery. The *dénouement* was exciting, and the last scene most animating. "What the devil," you will say, "is this play you are inventing?" Nay, Christian, I am relating a fact. The spectacle we saw to-day was that of our landlady engaged in a desperate fight with the maid. The trumpet had sounded long before the encounter, as violent abuse was hurled from both quarters. On this occasion the forces parted on equal terms, neither side gaining a triumph. It took place in the garden, while we looked on in silence from the parlour, not without laughter. But hear the catastrophe. After the fight the girl came up to my chamber to make the beds. In talking to her I praised her courage in having been a match for her mistress in noise and abuse, and said I wished she had been as brave with her hands as with her tongue. For the mistress, a stout termagant that might have passed for an athlete, kept on pommeling the head of the girl, who was shorter than herself, with her fists. "Have you, then, no nails," I said, "that you put up with such blows for nothing?" She answered with a grin that she did not want will, but strength. "Do you fancy," said I, "that the issue of battles depends only on strength? The plan of attack is always most important." Then she asked what advice I had to give her. "When she attacks you again," said I, "do you at once pull off her cap." For these housewives of Paris are marvelously fond of wearing a black cap of a peculiar fashion. "When you have pulled that off, you can then fly at her hair." As all this was said by me in jest, I supposed it had been taken in the same sense. But just before supper-time a stranger comes running in breathless. . . . "Come here," said he, "my masters, and you will see a bloody spectacle." We rushed to the spot, and found the landlady and her maid struggling on the ground; and it was with some difficulty that we parted them. How bloody the battle had been was shown by the result. Strewn on the floor lay on one side the cap, and on the other the girl's kerchief, and the ground was covered with tufts of hair, so cruel had been the slaughter. As we sat at supper the landlady related, with much indignation, how stoutly the girl had borne herself. "When I was preparing," said she, "to chastize her" (that is, to pommel her with fisticuffs), "she at once pulled the cap off my head!" I recognized that my song had not been sung to deaf ears. "As soon as that was done, the hussy brandished it in my eyes." That was no part of my counsel. "Then," said she, "she tore out as much of my hair as you see here." She took heaven and earth to witness that she had never met with a girl so small and so vicious. We did our best to palliate human events and the doubtful fortune of war, and to treat of peace for the future. Meantime I congratulated myself that the mistress had no suspicion of the affair having been conducted by my advice, as I should otherwise have found for myself that she had a tongue in her head.'

for t
wha
at th
whic
publ
a co
to re
jest
with
pen
in w
repr
char
with

brou
youn
thit
his
self
dest
com
Eng
a sh
frien
more
Cata
hear

More
as th
Arthu
we ca
of M
Princ
royal
bined
eleve
on hi
arms
to th
him
thing
occas
time

We have quoted this letter at some length, not so much for the comic element in it, which, we confess, seems somewhat forced, as for the unconscious revelation it affords, even at this early period, of that trait in the character of Erasmus which is chiefly conspicuous in his writings and shaped his public life. We refer to his disposition to stand aloof from a controversy, fearing to be drawn into the strife, yet unable to refrain from helping the weaker party by advice 'given in jest and expected to be taken in the same sense'—not always with the same impunity as in the instance he relates. No pen could have touched off more happily than his own a scene in which the mistress and the maid in the above letter should represent the Church and the Reforming Movement, the only character needing no change being Erasmus himself, though with more tragedy than comedy in the event.

An event of the utmost importance to Erasmus was brought about by his new mode of life in Paris. Among the young Englishmen of birth and fortune who, having repaired thither to complete their studies, placed themselves under his instruction was William Blount, Lord Mountjoy, himself an English peer, stepson to the Earl of Ormond, and destined to hold high office in the English Court. In the company of Lord Mountjoy, Erasmus made his first visit to England, in the summer of 1499, during which he resided for a short time at Oxford, and laid the foundation of his famous friendships with our English scholars and statesmen. Even more noteworthy is his first glimpse, thus recorded in the *Catalogue of Lucubrations*, of the boy-prince in whose young heart lay pent up earthquake and eclipse :

'I was staying at Lord Mountjoy's country-house when Thomas More came to see me, and took me out with him for a walk as far as the next village, where all the king's children, except Prince Arthur, who was then the eldest son, were being educated. When we came into the hall, the attendants not only of the palace but also of Mountjoy's household, were all assembled. In the midst stood Prince Henry, then nine years old, and having already something of royalty in his demeanour, in which there was a certain dignity combined with singular courtesy. On his right was Margaret, about eleven years of age, afterwards married to James, King of Scots ; and on his left played Mary, a child of four. Edward was an infant in arms. More, with his companion, Arnold, after paying his respects to the boy Henry, the same that is now King of England, presented him with some writing. For my part, not having expected anything of the sort, I had nothing to offer, but promised that on another occasion I would in some way declare my duty towards him. Meantime I was angry with More for not having warned me, especially as

the boy sent me a little note, while we were at dinner, to challenge something from my pen. I went home, and in the Muses' spite, from whom I had been so long divorced, finished the poem within three days.'

The poem was sent to the young prince, with a dedication which concludes thus :

'We have for the present dedicated these verses, like a gift of playthings, to your childhood, and shall be ready with more abundant offerings when your virtues, growing with your age, shall supply more abundant material for poetry. I would add my exhortation to that end, were it not that you are of your own accord already, as they say, under way, with all sails set ; and have with you Skelton, that incomparable light of British letters, who can not only kindle your studies, but bring them to a happy conclusion. Farewell, and may Good Letters be illustrated by your splendour, protected by your authority, and fostered by your liberality.'

That he enjoyed his visit to England may be judged by the following, from Ep. 98 (p. 203) :

'We, too, have made progress in England. The Erasmus you once knew is now become almost a sportsman, no bad rider, a courtier of some practice, bows with politeness, smiles with grace ; and all this in spite of himself. If you are wise, you, too, will fly over here. Why should a man with a nose like yours grow to old age with nothing but French filth about him. But you will say, your gout detains you. The devil take your gout if he will only leave *you* ! Nevertheless, did you but know the blessings of Britain, you would clap wings to your feet and run hither ; and if the gout stopped you, would wish yourself a Dædalus.'

Then follows the passage in which he mentions with keen appreciation 'the fashion in England, never to be commended enough,' of kissing. Certainly there had been a butterfly development of the studious young brother at Stein, the half-starved student at Montaigu, or the monk who had formed such good resolutions when he was sick. It is amusing to note how different in tone are the letters to his superior, written in dread of a recall to the convent, and anxious to dispel the notion either that he was maintaining himself in luxury or neglecting sacred studies. Thus :

Erasmus to his Father in Religion, Nicholas Werner.

'If you are all well at Stein, it is what we wish and trust. For my part, I am thankful to say I am heartily well. If anyone has doubted how much I value sacred learning, I have now shown it by evidence of fact. I am using boastful language, but Erasmus must not hide anything from his loving father.

'I have lately fallen in with some Englishmen, all of noble birth

and I
the p
of a b
Never
by th
sand
began
lived
crown
withi
crown
benef
oblig
famili
ample
entrea
care
consi
by an
learn,
God v

'
promi
libera

W

learn
solic
Cam
earlie
he ca
but h
he w
some
many
claim
cares
Erasm

'
literat
sister
the go
that, b
not to
an inc
Virgin
requir

and high rank. Very lately a young man in priest's orders joined the party. He had abundance of money and had refused the offer of a bishopric, because he was aware of his deficiency in learning. Nevertheless, within a year he is again to be invited to that dignity by the king, although without any bishopric he possesses two thousand crowns a year. When he heard of my knowledge of letters he began to exhibit an incredible regard and respect for me; for he lived some little time in my household. He offered me a hundred crowns if I would instruct him for a year. He offered me a benefice within a few months; and he offered to lend me three hundred crowns to maintain my position until I should repay it out of the benefice. If I had chosen to accept his proposals, I should have obliged all the English in this city, for they are all of the highest families, and through them all England. I have turned my back on ample fortune, and still more ample expectations. I have disregarded entreaties backed with tears. . . . The English now know that I care nothing for all the wealth of England. Neither is it without consideration that I refused and still refuse these offers. I will not by any bribe be led away from sacred studies. I have come here to learn, not to teach or to heap up money. Indeed, I intend to apply, God willing, for a doctorate in theology.

'The Bishop of Cambrai is a wonderful friend to me. He promises liberally, but, to tell the plain truth, he does not send liberally. Farewell' (pp. 117-8).

With all these professions of a disinterested love of learning, it is painful to read the unfortunate and adulatory solicitations for money which he addressed to the Bishop of Cambrai and to another patron, who figures largely in his earlier correspondence, Ann, the Lady of Vere. *Gnathonisms*, he called them, and perpetrates them not without shame; but his self-respect yielded before necessity, which, delicate as he was and luxuriously inclined, was with him a term of somewhat liberal interpretation. Doubtless, also, he felt, as many others have felt with less justice, that genius has a claim on wealth and a right to be relieved of the meaner cares of life. The following extracts will exhibit how low an Erasmus could fall:

Erasmus to the Lady of Vere.

'Three Annas have been commended to posterity by ancient literature; one, called Perenna, who for her singular devotion to her sister Dido was believed by antiquity to have been received among the gods; another, the wife of Elkanah, for whom it is praise enough that, by the Divine blessing, she gave birth in her old age to Samuel, not to be of service to herself, but to be a devout priest of God and an incorruptible judge of His people; the third, the parent of the Virgin Mother, the grandmother of Jesus, God and man, who requires no further eulogy. The first has been consecrated by the

Roman Muses to immortality. The second has been extolled in the Hebrew annals. The third is worshipped by Christian piety, and has been celebrated by the eloquent verse of Rodolphus Agricola and Baptista Mantuanus. May Heaven grant such virtue to my writings that posterity, not unacquainted with your pious, chaste, and stainless heart, may number a fourth Anna with the other three. So shall it be if only one feeble genius be equal to your merit. . . . I may venture to confess that I am the more attracted to you because I see that deity of Rhamnus, whom I have always found most unkind to me, is not altogether well disposed to you; for a fellowship in misfortunes is often a means of knitting people together. But what comparison can be drawn between us? Your rank is almost placed beyond the risks of Fortune, who yet sometimes gives you a pinch; but against me she rages with a constancy which is the one quality not like herself, as if she had entered into a conspiracy against my Letters. . . . But I am ashamed, so help me Heaven, that I, a man, in some degree fortified by the protection of learning, and armed with the precepts of philosophy, should lose my courage; while you, whom Nature has made a woman, and who have been born in the highest station and brought up in the greatest luxury, have still something to suffer, and bear it in no womanly spirit. I should remember, too, that, however Fortune may thunder against me, there is no excuse for my abandoning letters or allowing my heart to fail, so long as you shine before my eyes as a Cynosure of security. Letters we cannot be deprived of by Fortune; and those little means which my leisure requires your wealth, abundant as your liberality, can easily supply. . . . And as for any poor return I may make, whatever my poor genius can do shall be exerted to the utmost, that future ages may know that there existed at this extremity of the world one lady by whose beneficence good letters, corrupted by the ignorance of the unskilful, ruined by the default of princes, neglected by the indifference of mankind, were encouraged to raise their head. . . . I send you herewith another *Anna*, a poem, or rather some verses, I made when quite a boy, which may show you the ardent veneration which from my youthful days I have cherished for that Saint.¹

The following is written to James Batt, his devoted and constant friend:

'If you are heartily interested in my fortune, this is what you must do. You will make a fair excuse to my Lady, that I cannot for very shame expose my own destitution before her, but that I am now in the deepest poverty, this flight to Orleans having been a great expense, as I had to leave behind some sources of income; that a doctor's degree cannot be so properly taken as in Italy; that Italy cannot be visited by so delicate a man without a considerable sum of money, especially as my reputation, whatever it may be worth, as a man of learning forbids my living in an altogether mean fashion.

¹ *Ep.* 137, pp. 294-6.

You
learn
unle
foun
tell
eloqu
my a
will
less
have
retur
quiet
appli
whom
way

I
may
gain

with
and
list
the
able
and
hims
disting

Italy,
celebr
absur
the se
whit
by all
the co
title,

Halte
Bolog
Julius
and
ingen

as E
the c
which

You will point out how much more credit I shall do her by my learning than the other divines whom she maintains . . . such unlearned divines abound everywhere ; men like me are scarcely found in many centuries—unless, indeed, you are too scrupulous to tell a few fibs for a friend. . . . When you have expended your eloquence on these subjects, and have enlarged upon my character, my aspirations, my attachment to her, and my natural reserve, you will then add that I have written to you that I could not do with less than two hundred francs, so that the next year's pension would have to be paid in advance. Then press her to provide me on my return with some preferment upon which I may devote myself in quiet to literature. Of course, I am aware that there are many applicants for livings ; but you can say that I am the one person whom, if she compares with the rest, &c., &c. You know your old way of lying profusely in praise of your Erasmus.'

It is pleasing to reflect, and perhaps Erasmus himself may afterwards have been gratified to remember, that he gained comparatively little by such ignoble stooping.

The limits of our space forbid us to linger, as we should with delight, on his second, more prolonged visit to England, and the many beloved and famous names he added to the list of his friends. Through their frank liberality, and not by the bounty of patrons extorted by servility, he was at length able to carry out his long-cherished project of visiting Italy and obtaining a doctor's degree in divinity ; not that he himself set a great value on it, but because an extraordinary distinction and authority were attached to it in that age.

'I have long felt,' he wrote, 'the necessity of two things : to visit Italy, so that my little learning may derive an authority from the celebrity of the place, and to take the title of Doctor. The one is absurd as the other ; for they do not change their minds who cross the sea, as Horace says ; nor will the shadow of a name make me a whit more learned. But it is no use acting a good play to be hissed by all the audience : and we must put on the lion's skin, to force the conviction of our competence on those who judge a man by his title, and not by his books, which indeed they do not understand.'

He took his degree at Turin, the first place at which he halted for any considerable time ; and thence returned to Bologna, where he witnessed the triumphal entry of Pope Julius II., a spectacle which made a deep impression on him, and to which he often referred, with censure. '*Spectabam, ut ingenuè dicam, non sine tacito gemitu.*'

It was then, while Pope Julius was still in the city, and, as Erasmus asserted, by dispensation from him, that he made the change in his dress from the habit of an Augustinian monk, which he had hitherto worn, though generally covered up, to

the dress of an ordinary priest. In defence of this step he urged the plausible excuse that the resemblance of the habit to the costume of the physicians employed to tend the plague-stricken brought upon him a violent attack by some ignorant people for not keeping out of their way. The excuse was perhaps as unreal as the dispensation; but in the year 1517 a dispensation, undoubtedly granted by Pope Leo X., practically freed him from his monastic obligation, and relieved his mind of the fears of a recall, which had constantly harassed him ever since his escape from the Convent of Stein. Not only was he now free from the control of his order, but every disability was removed which, arising out of the circumstances of his birth, might be urged against the validity of his orders or his title to a benefice.

We cannot follow him to Pavia, Venice, Padua, Ferrara, Siena, Rome, and Naples; but, remembering a recent bull-fight in which an armoured motor-car was substituted for the ordinary assailants of the victim, we may turn a glance of amusement to a bull-fight he witnessed at Siena, in which huge wooden machines in the likeness of various beasts, moved by men inside them, charged the hapless brute; and we may question whether, after four centuries, our imagination is as superior to theirs as our machinery.

We must snatch a glimpse of him at Rome:

'When I was at Rome, after I had been invited by Cardinal Griniani to visit him, . . . and the invitation had been more than once repeated—so much did I dislike paying court to the great—at last I went to his palace, rather from shame than from inclination. There was no creature to be seen either in the court or in the vestibule. It was afternoon. I gave my horse to my servant, and mounting the stairs by myself, went into the first reception-room. I saw no one. I went into the second and third. Just the same. I found no door closed, and marvelled at the solitude around me. Coming to the last room, I found one person keeping watch at an open door. He had the tonsure, and was, I believe, a Greek physician. I asked him how the Cardinal was engaged. He said he was within, talking with several gentlemen. I made no reply, and he asked what I wanted. "To pay my respects to him," said I, "if it had been convenient; but, as he is not at leisure, I will call again." As I turned to go, I lingered at a window to look at the view, and the Greek came to me again, to inquire whether I wished any message to be taken to the Cardinal. "There is no need," said I, "to interrupt his conversation, but I will come back shortly." At last he asked my name, which I gave him. As soon as he heard it he went hastily in without my noticing it, and coming out directly, bade me not to go. Without further delay I was fetched in, and the Cardinal received me, not as a Cardinal, and such a Cardinal, might

recei
chai
hour
vello
muc
me
offer
befo
tong
sona
favo
and
Whe
ceas

if h
such
frien

prin
had
once
who
qual
havi
his
him
goo
that
ausp
here
is al
heav
and
weal
gem
you
said
foste
with
sayi
goo
alrea
that
to a

receive a person of humble rank, but as he might a colleague. A chair being placed for me, we talked together for more than two hours, and all that time I was not allowed to remove my hat, a marvellous act of courtesy from a man of such rank. In the midst of much learned talk about literary studies . . . he began to advise me not to leave Rome, the nursing-mother of intellects. . . . As I offered to rise, he stopped me, saying that a disciple should stand before his master. At last he showed me his library, rich in many tongues. If I had happened to become acquainted with this personage earlier, I should never have left the city, where I found more favour than I deserved. But I had already made up my mind to go, and things had gone so far that it was scarcely open for me to stay. When I told him I had been sent for by the King of England, he ceased to press me' (pp. 461-2).

He might, indeed, have become a colleague of the Cardinal if he had chosen to remain in Rome; but who could resist such an invitation as the following, addressed to him by his friend, Lord Mountjoy?

'I have no fear, my Erasmus, but when you heard that our prince, now Henry the Eighth, whom we may well call our Octavius, had succeeded to his father's throne all your melancholy left you at once. For what may you not promise yourself from a prince, with whose extraordinary and almost divine character you are well acquainted, and to whom you are not only known but intimate, having received from him (as few others have) a letter traced with his own fingers? But when you know what a hero he now shows himself, how wisely he behaves, what a lover he is of justice and goodness, what affection he bears to the learned, I venture to swear that you will need no wings to make you fly to behold this new and auspicious star. Oh, my Erasmus, if you could see how all the world here is rejoicing in the possession of so great a prince, how his life is all their desire, you could not contain your tears for joy. The heavens laugh, the earth exults, all things are full of milk, of honey, and of nectar! Avarice is expelled the country. Liberality scatters wealth with bounteous hand. Our king does not desire gold or gems or precious metals, but virtue, glory, immortality. I will give you an example. The other day he wished he was more learned. I said, "That is not what is expected of your Grace, but that you will foster and encourage learned men." "Yea, surely," said he, "for indeed without them we should scarcely exist at all." What more splendid saying ever fell from the lips of a prince. . . . I would bid you be of good cheer, if I did not think that without my bidding you are already hopeful, if you have any hope in you. Make up your mind that the last day of your wretchedness has dawned. You will come to a Prince who will say:

"Accept our wealth and be our greatest sage."

. . . Come to us as soon as you can.

The Palace, Greenwich, May 27, 1509' (pp. 457-61).

So we must leave him, speeding to 'Africa and golden joys'; how changed from that Erasmus who sighed to be free of the cloister or starved in a garret at Montaigu; who fawned on the Lady of Vere or trembled like a truant, half his life, at the thought of recapture. He 'claps wings to his feet,' and hastes to England and wealth, to high place and authority, to the intimate counsels of the king, to some large, far-reaching measure of reform; above all, to honour, security, peace. *So he thinks.* In a letter of the following year occurs for the first time the name of LUTHER; which, if he had been wise to hear, would have been to him the first tragic note of an Iliad of woes. But, as our author happily remarks: 'He has finished his prolonged *Lehrjahre* and *Wanderjahre*;' he is 42 years of age; he has seen many men and many cities; he has a fair field and his part to play in the world, happy if he have not already yielded his peace into the hand of his enemies!

ART. IX.—CANON CARTER OF CLEWER.

1. *A Memoir of John Armstrong, D.D., late Lord Bishop of Grahamstown.* By the Rev. T. T. CARTER, M.A., Rector of Clewer. With Introduction by Samuel, Lord Bishop of Oxford. (Oxford, 1857.)
2. *Harriet Monsell: a Memoir.* By the Rev. T. T. CARTER, Hon. Canon of Christ Church, Oxford, and Warden of the House of Mercy, Clewer. (London, 1889.)
3. *Sermons.* By THOMAS THELUSSON CARTER, M.A., Rector of Clewer, Berks. (London, 1862.)
4. *The Doctrine of Confession in the Church of England.* By the Rev. T. T. CARTER, M.A., Rector of Clewer, Berks. 2nd edition. (London, 1869.)

And other works.

THERE is an event in the Old Testament which comes to our mind with something of a deterrent effect, as we attempt to sketch the life and work of the late Canon T. T. Carter. 'Uzzah put forth his hand to the Ark,' and the judgment of the Lord fell upon him. What exactly was his sin is not explained, but it was probably some want of reverence in the act, some hasty handling of an object which should have been approached with greater recollectedness and awe. The fear is lest there should be something in these pages unfitting,

some
such
C
beaut
about
which
comp
Natur
of Cle
ance
not e
token
sweet
some
say th
quite
the br
while
to the
speak
his far
W
charac
always
biddin
readin
the m
He ha
could
had w
mately
not ke
turn a
Bright
charm
or atte
take in
charac
the m
penite
(there
of the
article
in 185
tentiar
VOL

something unworthy in the attempted portrait of a life of such holiness.

Canon Carter presented sanctity under the aspect of beauty. There are holy persons, but with something repellent about them. There is all the difference between a building which is surrounded with scaffolding and implements, and a completed structure with all unsightly materials removed. Nature and grace seem to have conspired together in 'Carter of Clewer' to form an attractive personality. His appearance arrested attention—a tall commanding presence, a face not easily forgotten, so full of loving-kindness, a brow betokening great intellectual power, a mouth a mixture of sweetness and determination, and eyes penetrating, which sometimes looked as if they glowed with fire. We cannot say that the painting of the late F. Holl, familiar to many, quite pleases us, excellent as it is as a work of art. We miss the brightness, the life, the vivacity—these seem to have fled, while the anatomy of the veins gives almost a death-like hue to the features. Those who looked upon him in the coffin speak of a colour in his cheeks, as if flushed with a touch of his far distant youth, as if radiant with hope.

We regard brightness as the dominant note of his character. The gleam would come and go; it seemed to be always ready at a moment's call, in greeting a friend, in bidding adieu, in the enjoyment of something which he was reading, in his delight in everything which was beautiful, in the midst of sorrow. Yet this last may be exaggerated. He had sorrows which left a lasting mark upon his life; it could not be otherwise in a nature so affectionate. But he had wonderful self-command. Those who knew him intimately could not make the mistake of imagining that he did not keenly *feel* trouble and bereavement; they have seen him turn aside and weep. True sanctity is never unnatural. Brightness without the note of sympathy would have little charm in this world of sin and sorrow. A sketch must be, or attempt to be, a 'vivid delineation of a person,' and so take into account, as far as possible, the different elements of character. Sympathy, of course, reinforced by grace, was the moving cause of the work at Clewer. Its origin was penitentiary work. We find in the earliest book of Mr. Carter (there was at least one earlier, *The Blessings of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper*) with which the writer of the present article is acquainted, the *Life of Bishop Armstrong*, published in 1857, how keenly he was touched with the Church Penitentiary movement, an object which 'excited his compassion,'

and in the promotion of which he found a worthy coadjutor in the late Bishop of Grahamstown, whose zeal and devotion to the cause greatly excited the admiration of the future Warden of Clewer. The 'Appeal' made in March 1849 was so warmly responded to, that in the June following the House of Mercy, Clewer, was begun.

We remember how Dr. Liddon, when lecturing upon St. Paul, said: 'As a rule, three elements were to be distinguished in the preparatory life of any men who achieved much,' viz. the raw material of personal character, an influence, and the fusion of both. The 'influence,' a mutual influence, seems to have been the early friendship between Mr. Carter and Bishop Armstrong, each acting on the other through the common sympathy in 'rescue work.' Of Bishop Armstrong Bishop Samuel Wilberforce said:

'Above all, he awakened through God's blessing those efforts on behalf of the most miserable class of outcast women, which have led to the exercise of so much of that skilful and affectionate care for such penitents, which surely ought especially to mark the followers of Him who, in spite of the jeers of the Pharisee, suffered the woman who had been a sinner to "wash His feet with her tears."'

One of these friends, so 'lovely in their lives,' was soon to occupy the new See of Grahamstown, and to pass early to his reward; the other, to become the leader of penitentiary work in his own land and to live to a great age. They were kindred spirits, and the pen of the one has perpetuated the memory of the other.

Our concern now with the Penitentiary Work at Clewer, of which Canon Carter was the Founder, and the beginning of which he describes in his memoir of *Harriet Monsell*, is only so far as it illustrates the character of our subject. We trace in it his intense sympathy for the fallen, and his practical wisdom. Penitentiary work, we need hardly say, was not an entirely new thing in the Church of England, but as it existed it created no enthusiasm, and but little hope. 'Facilis descensus Averni;—sed revocare gradum'—few had belief in such a return. To put new life into this, that was 'the work and the difficulty.' It was feared at the time that the idea of Sisters taking up penitentiary work 'would discourage the formation of Sisterhoods.' This junction was in our communion an experiment. The feeble efforts of existing penitentiaries seemed to be confined to the separation of the fallen from their surroundings, and to the formation of external regularity of life. It was felt that some 'vital change' was needed, and that the root of the evil had not

bee
and
som
rem
desi
con
hav
He
cate
we
was
Com
wom
of S
two
a few
of so
Engl
follow
and
tiarie
are t
articl
T
a few
Cl

St.
St.
St.
St.
St.
St.
St.
St.
St.
Th
Ho
Ho
Ox
Ho
St.
Ne
St.
A
St.
Ho

been reached. Then the instrumentality of 'self-devoted and unpaid ladies' was proposed, with the view of exercising some deeper spiritual influence on those who had been removed from a life of sin—this removal often through the desire of friends and relations, but without as yet any real conversion to God. Clewer through Mr. Carter seems to have supplied the first test of 'this new form of Church work.' He believed in the power of ladies, whose lives were dedicated to Christ, to deal with this terrible social evil; and, if we mistake not the order of events, compassion for the fallen was the source and origin of the Works at Clewer and of the Community. Penitentiary work began in 1849 with six women 'of the lowest and coarsest kind': the Community of St. John Baptist began in 1852. Now in fifty years the two or three ladies who offered themselves to take charge of a few 'penitents' at Clewer have developed into a Community of some three hundred Sisters, working in various parts of England, in New York, in Calcutta, and elsewhere, all following the rule which was sanctioned by their Founder and Warden; while the long list of good works—penitentiaries, refuges, orphanages, hospitals, schools, and parishes—are too many to be enumerated within the limits of this article.

The following statistics may give some idea of the size of a few of these Works:

Clewer House of Mercy accommodates 80 penitents and 33 magdalens.

St. John's Home, 68 girls, orphans.

St. Andrew's Hospital, 85 beds.

St. Andrew's Cottage, 8 ladies.

St. Stephen's College, 50 young ladies.

St. Stephen's High School, 60 children—170 with day scholars.

St. Augustine's Home, 50 boys.

St. John Baptist School, King Henry's Road, South Hampstead, 23 girls.

St. Barnabas Orphanage, 60 orphans.

The Refuge at Pimlico, 13 women.

Home of the Good Shepherd, Leytonstone, 60 girls.

Home for Working Girls, Blackfriars, 66 girls.

Oxford Penitentiary, 60 women and 6 magdalens.

House of Mercy, Bovey Tracey, Devon, 80 penitents.

St. Lucy's Home, Gloucester, 35 girls.

Newark House, Hampstead, 30 girls (preventive).

St. Andrew's Hospital, Folkestone, 130 patients.

A Rescue Home, 53 children.

St. Michael's Home, Leamington, 32 penitents.

House of Mercy, Great Maplestead, 50 penitents.

Diocesan House of Mercy, Highgate, 60 penitents.

Pratt Memorial School, Calcutta, 80 boarders.

European Orphanage, 60 boarders.

Diocesan School, Darjeeling (Anglo-Indian), 90 boarders.

Besides large works in the United States of America, the Mother House being 233 East 17th Street, New York.

Of course, this vast organization is not the product of one unaided personality, however remarkable. There are several whose names Canon T. T. Carter would mention, if he were writing this; there is one which we cannot pass over, that of 'Harriet Monsell,' of whom it has been truly said that, when the history of the revival of Sisterhoods in our Church is written, 'a golden page will be given to Mother Harriet.' She was Superior of Clewer for nearly a quarter of a century, and but for her assistance Clewer would not have been what it is. But it was Bruno who drew devoted followers to the beautiful valley of Chartreuse; and it was Thomas Thelusson Carter who, by his spiritual attractiveness, drew souls to Clewer who desired to offer themselves to live entirely for God.

Though it may truly be said of him, as you stand in the midst of the institutions at Clewer, 'Si monumentum requiris, circumspice,' we must not forget his long services rendered to the Church as a parochial clergyman. T. T. Carter, from the time of his ordination, was a zealous parish priest, and continued these labours until 1880, when he had nearly reached the age of seventy-three. He was born in Eton, March 19, 1808. Nearly the whole of his very long life was spent in or near Clewer. We have been told that at little more than six years old he went to school at Eton. He graduated at Christ Church, Oxford, in 1831, First Class, *Lit. Hum.* He was ordained deacon at Salisbury in 1832, and so lived nearly the 'three score years and ten' in Holy Orders. His first curacy was at Reading, under Dean Milman. From Reading he went to Burnham, and became curate to his father, and was ordained priest in Buckingham Palace Chapel. The annexation of Berkshire and Buckinghamshire with the Oxford diocese only came about in 1836 and 1837. The Rev. T. T. Carter was married at Pitminster Church, near Taunton, to Mary Anne Gould, the second daughter of John and Jane Gould, who resided at Amberd House, in that parish. For a few years he was rector of a little country parish in Dorset, where he laboured to restore the parish church, and where a memorial is now being raised to him. At Clewer, before the House of Mercy was built, a few fallen women were received into a private house, and attended regularly the

ser
rec
de
fro
He
by
gre
gen

mu
enc
hav
In
tho
alm
wor
who
his
nes
offi
as v
will
to e
tim
perl
othe
in ti
wea
of a
The
was
late
an c
som
grac
Min
thou
'Thi
cont
we h

outer
fellow
open
of gui

services at the parish church, which was restored by the rector with the greatest care, and beautified; and where a devoted congregation regularly attended his ministrations, from the parish and the neighbourhood, Windsor and Eton. He was rector of Clewer from 1844 to 1880. Though hardly by nature adapted for ministering to poor people, he was greatly beloved by them, because of his kind sympathy and generosity.

In any sketch of Canon T. T. Carter's life some allusion must be made to the great and exhausting labours which he endured as a spiritual guide. There must be thousands who have known him in this capacity, some for half a century. In earlier days, when such help was not often near at hand, those who sought his guidance came from all parts. It is almost too sacred to do more than touch this branch of his work, carried on till within two days of his death. Many who read these lines will recall blessings which they owe to his ministrations. They will all testify to his delicate tenderness and quick sympathy. He was never mechanical or official. Numbers who came to him in trial and perplexity, as well as those who sought his help when burdened with sin, will remember the absorbed attention with which he ministered to each one, as if the same had some special claim upon his time, his thought, his prayers. And the interest which, perhaps, centred upon one in a family, stretched out to the others in tenderest inquiries and remembered intercessions, in time of sickness or other affliction. Yet this constant and wearying occupation of listening to the tale of sin or sorrow of all conditions of men did not seem to overcloud his life. The pained look, the obscuration of the gleam of brightness, was but for a moment; and the gentle smile returned. The late Canon, like the late Bishop of Durham, was undoubtedly an optimist, if by an optimist is meant one who ever sees some remnant of good in a character, some possibilities of grace and glory. We find a passage in a sermon in the *Ministry of Christ*, which is characteristic of the style and thought of the author, then in middle life, upon the words, 'This man receiveth sinners and eateth with them,' which contains a description of those spiritual interviews to which we have alluded. He says:

'What lessons are here given to the pastor of souls when this first outer intercourse has been passed through, the outer crust of human fellowship removed, and soul meets soul, and the inner life is laid open to the influences of individual teaching and personal cleansing, of guidance and discipline; when the grace of sacraments, of abso-

lutions and intercessions, casts the veil of an unearthly consciousness around, and the spirit is felt to commune with spirit, and the Unseen Presence more and more pervades the inner sense and desires of the new creature? What does the picture we have been contemplating of our Lord's ministry in the flesh teach us of the love, the spirituality, the chastened purity, the intense longing for souls and for the manifestation of the glory of God, which ought to animate such an inner circle of communion in the breath of that inner life in which the heart of God is ever moving in its inexhaustible longings for the perfect bliss of all whom He hath created for His own glory!

Here is the deep spirituality, expressed in long involved sentences, which those familiar with the writings of T. T. Carter will quickly recognize.

It is obvious in this connexion to refer to Canon Carter's teaching on the vexed subject of confession. This is contained in one of his earliest works, *The Doctrine of Confession in the Church of England*, the first edition of which appeared near the middle of the last century. His name is attached to a 'Declaration' on Confession, a long and rather elaborate statement, issued on December 6, 1873, which was intended to dispel serious misapprehensions on the subject, and to claim all that the Prayer Book preserved and allowed. Its limits also were clearly stated: 'The Church of England does not justify any priest in teaching that private confession is a condition indispensable to the forgiveness of sin after Baptism, or is a condition indispensable for receiving Holy Communion; yet that under certain circumstances the clergy are directed to "move" persons to such confession.' In this, as in all other matters, Canon Carter was ever loyal to the teaching of the Church of England. As an evidence of this temper of mind, his desire not to go beyond what the Church of England permits or encourages, we may note his treatment of the General Confession and Absolution in our Prayer Book. He did not regard them as worthless for the purpose, but as supplying 'some measure at least of the grace of this ministry to all who frequent the services of the Church, thus meeting, so far as possible, the needs of those who, from whatever cause, make use of the liberty to confess themselves to God alone.' And again, 'the Church of England undoubtedly attaches more value to general confessions and absolutions than Western Christendom had been accustomed to do for some centuries previous to the Reformation.' On the other hand, he did not regard the directions of the Prayer Book as restricting the *liberty* of confession. Its habitual use in the formation of a saintly

character, especially in the case of those who were vowed to the service of God, he would have certainly encouraged; or, on the other hand, in the case of those who were recovering from a life of deadly sin. A very different view was taken by many of the public absolutions. Maskell, after stating that there are 'seven theories' about them as to their efficacy, held himself that the grace of absolution only followed upon 'particular confession.' Canon Carter, though in the mid-stream of the 'Catholic Movement,' never uttered a word of disparagement of the English formularies, though at the same time clearly asserting the greater blessing which under certain circumstances would be obtained by private confession to God before the priest.

Canon Carter was considered great as a preacher, but not in the popular sense. A great preacher, on being told that his sermons were to be printed, conceitedly replied, 'You must print me too.' Such words could never have escaped from the lips of the saintly Carter, but they would have been true. There was a charm in his presence and in his voice, though it was not strong. Yet he has been heard well at the end of St. James's Hall when stirred by some great Church question. There were certain centres of spiritual activity where he repeatedly preached. It will recall reminiscences in many if we select two for special mention—All Saints, Margaret Street, and All Saints, Clifton. These churches, especially in the earlier days of the Oxford Movement, were fountains of influence, and men of mark from all parts of the country had the privilege of preaching during the Octaves of the Dedication Festivals. The present Dean of Chichester was a master in the arrangement of these series of sermons at Clifton. The name of the Rev. T. T. Carter appears as one of the preachers at the consecration of All Saints, Margaret Street in 1850; he occupied the pulpit on the Thursdays in the Lent following, and on many subsequent occasions. It will be remembered how the thin volumes entitled *The Life of Imitation*, *The Life of Sacrifice*, *The Life of Penitence*, &c., contained in permanent form the devotional addresses which had been delivered. These sermons drew together a large number of devout and cultured persons, who were able to appreciate and follow his teaching. All Saints, Clifton, we believe, ten years later followed the example of its namesake in London. Here the Rev. T. T. Carter preached upon such themes as 'The Blessed State of the Saints departed,' 'The Son's Compassion for the Children of God,' 'The Pure in Heart in the Beatific Vision,' 'Our Blessed Lord

transforming our nature in the Holy Eucharist,' 'The Likeness of God seen in His Saints,' &c.

In the earlier part of his ministry he was in the habit of writing his sermons, and in a hand which was hopelessly illegible to a stranger; and his letters are, of course, in the same hand. He thought and wrote rapidly, sometimes kneeling on one knee and not keeping firm grasp of the paper, so that the writing twisted about and often ended with the 'T. T. C.' in the extreme corner of the page. But there are those who could read every word, from acquaintance with the hand, and also with the mode of expression. In later life he acquired the habit of preaching without manuscript or notes, in a meditative style, his thoughts often expressed in beautiful language, and his countenance growing radiant when something heavenly or Divine was upon his lips; but it was the sustained earnestness of the preacher, the evident love of God, the absence of all striving for effect, the insight into the soul's real needs, the commingling stream of tenderness and austerity in the teaching, which arrested the attention and stirred the conscience, and opened up to many a vista of new life and holiness.

While treating of his preaching, we must not forget his great power as a conductor of Retreats. He was one of the first to revive these devotional exercises. The essay on *The Church and the World* in 1868 supplied a *rationale* of this practice, which Canon Carter regarded as 'too closely imbedded in Holy Scripture to admit of mere party considerations.' In his *Retreats, with Notes and Addresses*, published as late as 1893, he gives the 'points,' and provides a summary of some of his addresses. Extremely useful as they are, they are but outlines. They will suffice, however, to recall to many days and gatherings at Cuddesdon which will ever be treasured. They were turning points to some. Canon Carter's powers were especially suited for the conduct of such hours of retirement. His addresses seemed to be the outcome of his own life and meditations. He did not bind himself in any way to the Ignatian method, though thoroughly acquainted with it, but appeared to be drawing upon his own communings with God. In his later days, his style, in consequence of the habit of giving spiritual meditations, partook very much of what is customary in Retreats. It may be of interest to give the outline of one of his Retreats, given at Cuddesdon in 1864. It consists of a preliminary address, in which the necessary 'dispositions' for entering Retreats are set forth. Address I. 'The Life of Self-knowledge'—most

sear
'Lif
dres
sins
Pra
'Lif
Can
met

min
alw
rest
to l
effe
was
ladi
wou
ling
tem
serv
Rel
own
kin
'imp
God
serv
toge
and
the
com

Th
tuti
real
his
sho
cler
to g
and
tion

in a
auth
freq
tha
the

searching. Address II. 'Life of Contrition.' Address III. 'Life of Self-surrender'—Christ-like, definite, entire. Address IV. 'Life of Religious Activity'—avoid return of old sins, dangers of success, externalism. Address V. 'Life of Prayer'—preparation, adoration, dependence. Address VI. 'Life of Repose'—amid outward activities. Here Canon Carter's acquaintance with the Sulpician as well as Ignatian methods is noticeable.

Notwithstanding Canon Carter's contemplative turn of mind, and sometimes apparent abstraction of manner, he always kept before him practical aims, and especially in the restoration of the Religious Life. His attention seems at first to have been drawn to it, as we have seen, for the more effective dealing with penitentiary work. He saw holiness was needed for attacking strongholds of sin, and that refined ladies, who had learnt sympathy at the foot of the Cross, would make better nurses in hospitals than the ordinary hireling. It seems not to have been his intention to revive contemplative and enclosed orders, but dedicated women for the service of Christ. At the same time he meant to restore the *Religious Life* as a distinct vocation. The following is his own description of a Sisterhood as distinguished from other kinds of associated communities of women. He says it

'implies a vocation to live and work wholly and individually for God, as a permanent state; an aptitude for devotion and useful service; a religious rule; fellowship in prayer and work, binding all together; a gradation of offices with gradation of authority; rights and customs carefully guarded; and a systematic way of adapting the capacities and dispositions of the different members of the community to the necessities of the work undertaken.'

Thus, in his estimation, a Community was not only an institution for the cultivation of personal holiness, but also for the realization of the 'highest idea of Christian work.' That was his view. And he also, if we may express our opinion, showed his strong good sense in utilizing the assistance of clergy and laity, men of business, in councils and committees, to give advice in the conduct of the different religious works and finance, but not to interfere with the life and organization of the Sisterhood.

Again, he showed practical wisdom as well as tenderness in avoiding as much as possible the collisions between parental authority and religious vocation, which were likely to be more frequent in the revival of the Religious Life in our country than where it has never been in abeyance. No ladies, under the age of twenty-five, were to enter the Community of St.

John Baptist, Clewer, without parental consent. And those who entered kept up natural affections, and were allowed to renew them by a visit, we believe, annually to their homes. These were not merely tactics to avoid strife, but the outcome of a heart which, while fully recognizing the supreme claim of vocation, was full of the sweetest consideration for parents. He would never allow any disparagement of domestic life nor any invidious comparisons between Community and married conditions. He would point to the differences of vocation as reflected in the variety of natural beauty, each calling claiming from the other 'respect, sympathy, and love.'

There are many who have formed the notion that Canon Carter was a sort of knight-errant, whose name was to be found among those who took a prominent part in the heated ecclesiastical disputes of the day, and that with great effect. There are, perhaps, certain elements of truth in this estimate, but it gives a very erroneous view of his character. His name, it must be admitted, occupies a conspicuous place in those organizations which were called into existence in consequence of the Church controversies in his day. He was a Vice-President of the 'English Church Union,' and the Founder and for many years Superior-General of the 'Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament,' the last an exclusively devotional Society. But he was only forced into controversy when he felt it necessary to defend what he believed to be the best interests of the Church, and when others turned to him for guidance in some 'crisis' of the Church. He was naturally meek, gentle, retiring, averse to strife. But when some part of the Church's heritage, the Church of England which he loved so dearly, seemed to him at stake, he would conquer his natural temperament, and go forth courageously to defend her rights. And even then, as a disputant he was ever the pink of courteousness, and of fairness in argument as well as force. We will take two illustrations. The three letters written to His Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury in 1877 and 1878, entitled respectively 'Constitutional Order, the Rightful Claim of the Church of England'; 'A Further Plea' for the same; and 'The present Movement a true Phase of Anglo-Catholic Church Principles,' were models of courteous and cogent reasoning. The damage which he did to the principle of the Privy Council judgments, that 'omission is prohibition' has never been repaired, though attempts have been made in that direction. These letters fill more than 170 pages of printed matter, and bear witness to the logical and historical knowledge of the writer, and are not

marred by one word of bitterness, or even dubious expression on the score of respect. They calmed the storm, and re-stated the true principles of the Oxford Movement—the 'old historic High Churchmanship.'

Another instance of his gentleness and courage is to be found in his behaviour as Rector of Clewer under an attack, the character of which we do not care to describe: it can be gathered from documents in the archives of the Diocese of Oxford. His forbearance, and yet manly adherence to principle, were conspicuous throughout the case, which ended in securing, in the highest Court, to the episcopate its rightful power. In the *Diocesan History of Oxford* this event is referred to in the following terms: 'A signal benefit has been conferred upon the Church at large, and not upon the Diocese alone, in the vindication of the authority of the bishop and his perfect liberty of instituting, or of not instituting, a suit, when it is desired to promote the office of the judge under the provisions of the Clergy Discipline Act.'¹ Having secured this benefit to the Church, Canon Carter resigned his living. He felt this was due to Bishop Mackarness, who had behaved so nobly in the case. As there were not wanting those who thought the Bishop had put some pressure upon him to resign, Canon Carter at once wrote to the papers, stating that there was not 'a shadow of truth in this'; that Bishop Mackarness 'was one of the most just, honourable, and liberal-minded of men'; that the Bishop 'had shown in defence of a great principle considerable legal acumen'; and had never given 'the slightest indication of his wish that I should resign.' He further adds: 'When the Bishop had won his case on appeal, my course seemed to me clear. I could not change anything, believing what I had done to be true: and I could not take advantage of the Bishop's kindness and self-sacrifice, so as to expose him to the certain reproach of favouring what at the time was very generally thought to be illegal.'

In a sketch of the Life and Letters of Canon Carter some comments may be expected upon his view of the Ritual question in general. He regarded it certainly from a practical standpoint. He saw the importance of certain 'points' of ritual as witnessing to the continuity of the English Church—to use Professor Freeman's expression, the 'absolute identity' of the Church of England before the Reformation with the Church of England after the Reformation. Besides this, we have to take into account his natural sense of beauty, in

¹ 3 & 4 Vict. c. 86.

consequence of which a solemn ceremonial in his case would be sure to aid devotion, would have an elevating effect, a 'soaring upward,' an expression which he used in reference to the ascending fumes of incense. To the recent ruling concerning this beautiful symbol, he felt the clergy were called upon to submit, but he had the hope that this would be only for a time, and that some regulation in its use would be the final result—that is, he added, 'if the laity continue to desire it.' He would also retain the use of incense in processions, which were not touched by the judgment. He thought that perhaps this 'rebuff' would be a good checking of 'extremes,' and a staying time, which would bring back more 'ordered ways.' But the Lambeth 'Opinion' was really a grief to him. He had a hope, too—he was always hopeful—that the submission of High Churchmen might draw other sections of the Church, not distinguished by obedience to rubrics, into better line. Canon Carter's practical genius also discerned the fact that people were taught, especially the poor, more directly through the eye than through the ear; and that belief must find its expression in the ceremonial of the Altar, if the Presence of the Lord and the pleading of His Sacrifice are to be realized in the celebration of the Blessed Sacrament. But he was slow in introducing unaccustomed ceremonial into his church. For a long time the black gown held its place in the pulpit, and the children of the Orphanage occupied the chancel. His method was almost an illustration of the text, 'He that believeth shall not make haste,' and was commented upon adversely by those who were in a hurry and precipitated changes.

Canon Carter took a broad common-sense view of the rubrics. Rubrics designed to prevent abuses which no longer existed, he felt might be interpreted on the *mutatis mutandis* principle. He would not discourage a priest, for instance, from celebrating the Holy Eucharist because he could not be certain that three would communicate. He would be in harmony with the spirit rather than the letter in such a case. In the same way, he would take the practical view as to the question of reservation for the sick. The rubric which at the time was intended to prevent profanity, would not touch the reservation for the sick, under episcopal restriction. At the same time, he would be careful to draw the distinction between reservation for the sick and reservation for devotional purposes. In his Preface to the Rev. T. E. Kempe's book he makes this clear, and does not advocate the latter. There was the same flexibility in dealing with Dissenters. He drew

a distinction between Dissenters of our own country and Presbyterians from Scotland or Lutherans from Germany. And those Dissenters who resided in England and wished to avail themselves of the ordinances of the National Church, we have heard that even those he would not repel from Communion when they had not been confirmed and had not renounced their errors. But of this we cannot speak with certainty. The former had been baptized, and had not taken up the position of Separatists from, or hostility towards, the National Church. Similarly, in parochial visitation of Dissenters, when they were extremely ill and approaching death, he would not deny them the Blessed Sacrament, if accepting the ministrations of the Church without question or opposition. Perhaps in communicating a dying man, the words in the Sarum Manual—*extra mortis articulum*—might afford some cover. This flexibility may be criticized, and, it may be said, has the danger of degenerating into laxity, or of being applied to what is bidden as well as to what is forbidden; but it was safe in Canon Carter's hands. The fact is, he had a dislike to hard and fast lines, and was no rigorist. He might have made the utterance his own, 'there are no outlines in Nature,' and a Turnerian haze might have had an attraction for him; but he would never allow any tampering with dogmatic definitions adopted by General Councils and accepted by the whole Church. The 'Vincentian Canon' would be final to him. Antiquity was the Court of Appeal, as with Pusey and Liddon and the old Oxford school. But, we repeat, he was no rigorist—he was a mystic, in the sense in which we call Thomas à Kempis a mystic, one who keenly apprehends, to use the language of our own day, 'the relation of the individual to the Absolute'; or, to use the language of theology: *Finis Theologiae Mysticae est, animam per viam perfectionis ducere usque ad unionem perfectae charitatis cum Deo*; 'the 'via' having three stages—purgative, illuminative, and unitive. Mysticism is really, says a great writer, only what John Wesley calls 'heart religion,' and a mystic is one who lives in the atmosphere of the supersensible Realities.

Space forbids our carrying this attempt at portraiture much further; but as we understand a volume entitled *The Life and Letters of the late Canon T. T. Carter* will in due time appear, we will content ourselves with a brief reference to two or three further matters of interest upon which the Warden of Clewer has from time to time expressed his mind. Though a friend of Mr. Gladstone from Christ Church days, in many respects he did not share his opinions. He

was against Disestablishment, although some who accorded with him on ecclesiastical questions thought separation from the State might bring greater freedom to the Church. With regard to the question of Welsh Disestablishment, he thought it would in time lead to 'Total Disestablishment,' while some Welsh clergy seemed to imagine that it might bring benefit to the Church's spiritual life in the Principality. His feeling was to hold on as long as possible to what had been so divinely preserved to us among the nations of the world. He feared, with Dollinger, that English Disestablishment 'would be a terrible shock throughout Christendom.' Yet it was his habit to look at all sides of a question, and he could see also that 'Disestablishment might be a solution of many difficulties' and be 'full of results we can hardly realize.'

Great interest will be taken in his posture towards the Church of Rome. Those who knew Canon Carter intimately will agree that it may be said of him, as of Pusey, 'he was never near the Church of Rome.' That feature of his mind, the love of freedom and the hatred of hard-and-fast lines, made him dislike the rigorous methods which Rome loves to adopt. His piety was in quite a different mould. Freedom of discussion, mutual intercourse of mind with mind, study of the Holy Scriptures, appeal to antiquity, conciliar definitions, Anglican authorities, Church history, the Oxford divines, &c., formed in the main his 'theological apparatus.' We do not know a line in all his writings in which he can be charged with favouring any distinctly Roman doctrine—but he unflinchingly claimed all that was Catholic as our own.

He strongly enjoined upon those under his care the devotional study of Holy Scripture, sometimes suggesting an Epistle for the purpose. He once said: 'I used to learn a psalm daily, and let it sink into my soul as its nourishment.' While not unacquainted with patristic divinity, he seemed to prefer to go to the fountain-head at once. This frame of mind is not easily shaken by the attacks of Romanism. He valued the 'Revised Version,' but he was very conservative in the matter of the 'Higher Criticism,' and the lengths which some younger men went in this direction pained him much. He heartily signed the 'Declaration' as to 'the Truth of Holy Scripture,' and thought the modern views were calculated to weaken belief in the Bible. He felt, too, that this teaching often went with the 'theory' of 'kenosis,' which he regarded as extremely dangerous. In all

this,
scho
falli
be r
view
that
prof
an a
refer
the s
infa
their
there
belie
Chur
by n
in t
answ
corru
mean
V
Cano
that
teach
num
best
We
Holi
Man
Nich
John
writ
of Cl
witne
but
earlie
A
besid
may
Pries
from
Mr. C
fessio
foun
point

this, he only stood on the same ground as the old Oxford school, that our 'Lord Jesus Christ had set the seal of His infallible sanction on the whole of the Old Testament.' It must be remembered, in forming an estimate of Canon Carter's views in regard to the 'Higher Criticism' and its tendencies, that his standpoint would be wholly different from that of the professional expert. The appeal to antiquity might create an *a priori* objection to it, but we do not mean that. We refer to the Canon's habit of viewing everything in relation to the spiritual life. Some who built only upon the doctrine of the infallibility of the letter of Holy Scripture made shipwreck of their faith, and his fear would be that the admission that there were errors in the Scriptures would lead to general unbelief in Revelation, in a country where the authority of the Church, the other ground of faith, was often disputed and by many ignored. If any error had been pointed out to him in the Bible, we think he would have been contented to answer in the words of St. Augustine, 'Either the reading is corrupt, or the translation faulty, or you fail to catch the meaning.'

We have incidentally referred in this memoir to some of Canon Carter's writings. In conclusion, we can only add that he has left to the Church a precious legacy of spiritual teaching in many volumes. He has also carefully edited a number of books of devotion, among which perhaps the best known and most valuable is *The Treasury of Devotion*. We would also mention *The Way of Life*, *The Path of Holiness*, *The Guide to Heaven*, *The Star of Childhood*, and a *Manual of Devotion for Sisters*, 2 vols. He edited also *Nicholas Ferrar* (Longmans) and *The Life and Times of John Kettlewell* (Longmans). To these last-named he has written Introductions, in which he shows how the higher side of Church of England teaching and practice was not without witness in earlier days, and that the Oxford Movement was but 'a revival, a recovery of lost treasures of the Church's earlier and truer state.'

As specimens of Canon Carter's controversial powers, besides the works which have been already referred to, we may point to one of his early writings, *The Doctrine of the Priesthood*, published by Masters in 1857. The volume arose from a debate which took place in a clerical society of which Mr. Carter was a member. We believe the work on Confession similarly originated. *The Roman Question* will be found to contain some trenchant strictures upon 'salient points' on which we are at issue with Rome. *Richard*

Temple West, the memoir of the vicar of St. Mary Magdalen, much loved, is another of Canon Carter's biographic efforts. *Parish Teachings*, in two volumes, contain courses of sermons delivered in Clewer Church in the author's simpler style; also *The Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*, as drawn from the Holy Scriptures and the Records of the Church of England (Longmans), is for parochial use. *Vows and the Religious State* (Longmans) will concern those who may be drawn to the religious life. In these pages Canon Carter traverses some views of the late Bishop of Lincoln and the grounds upon which the Bishop bases them. We must not altogether omit the six volumes of *Spiritual Instructions*, in which the author deals with the 'Divine Dispensations,' 'The Life of Grace,' 'The Religious Life,' 'Our Lord's Early Life,' and 'Entrance on His Ministry,' &c. (Longmans). Our last reference shall be to a volume of sermons entitled *The Spirit of Watchfulness* (Longmans). These were written when he was over ninety years of age. He passed away on October 28 (St. Simon and St. Jude), 1901.

It has sometimes been made a reproach to the Church of England that she has shown too practical a spirit; that she has been unable to foster the life of devotion; that she has failed to produce saints. It is probably characteristic of all cultivated English life, and a result of the national temperament, that the piety of an Englishman will be chastened and restrained, and that his devotions will not be marked by the exuberance which has sometimes been exhibited by Latin piety. But with that limitation, we hardly think the charge can be sustained. There has always been a tradition of devotion in the English Church; the spirit which fosters it was not created but invigorated and more widely diffused by the Oxford Movement, and Canon Carter represents both a noble example and a fruitful source of it. In the past year we have had to mourn some of the greatest scholars of the English Church. It is, we believe, a sign of its wide and widening powers of influencing different types of the Christian character that side by side with a statesman like Bishop Creighton, with historians like Bishop Stubbs and Dr. Bright, with a scholar like Bishop Westcott, it should have produced the less learned and profound, but equally strong and genuine devotion and piety of Canon Carter.

To t

31. E

32. M

33. A

34. J

IN t
taugh
of th
natur
conse
and
necte
does
East
very
less'
the s
and
'beco
Chris
Holy
sacri
the
VO

ART. X.—THE HOLY EUCHARIST: AN
HISTORICAL INQUIRY.

PART III.

To the lists of books prefixed to Part I. and Part II. add the following:

31. ΕΤΘΥΜΙΟΤ ΤΟΤ ΖΙΓΑΒΗΝΟΤ 'Ερμηνεία εἰς τὰς ἰδ' ἐπιστολὰς τοῦ ἀποστόλου Παύλου καὶ εἰς τὰς ζ' καθολικὰς νῦν πρῶτον ἐκ παλαιοῦ χειρογράφου ἐκδιδομένη. Τὸ ΝΙΚΗΦΟΡΟΤ ΚΑΛΟΓΕΡΑ. ('Εν Ἀθήναις, 1887.)
32. ΝΙΚΟΛΑΟΤ ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΤ ΜΕΘΩΝΗΣ Λόγοι δύο κατὰ τῆς αἵρέσεως τῶν λεγόντων τὴν σωτήριον ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν θυσίαν μὴ τῇ τρισυποστάτῳ θεότητι προσαχθῆναι, ἀλλὰ τῷ πατρὶ μόνῳ κ.τ.λ. Νῦν πρῶτον ἐκδοθέντες. Τὸ ΑΝΔΡΟΝΙΚΟΤ ΔΗΜΗΤΡΑΚΟΠΟΤΛΟΤ. ('Εν Λειψία, 1865.)
33. *Fasciculi Zizaniorum Magistri Johannis Wyclif cum Tritico.* Ascribed to THOMAS NETTER of Walden. Edited by the Rev. W. W. SHIRLEY, M.A. (Rolls Series, V.). (London, 1858.)
34. JOANNIS WICLIF *Triologus cum Supplemento Trialogi.* Illum recensuit, hoc primum edidit, utrumque commentario critico instruxit GOTTHARDUS LECHLER. (Oxonii, 1869.)

IN the first part of this article we showed that the theology taught by the Fathers, while not expressly defining the relation of the elements to the Body and Blood of Christ or the exact nature of the Eucharistic sacrifice, clearly affirmed that the consecrated bread and wine are Christ's Body and Blood, and that the Eucharist is a sacrifice and is intimately connected with what Christ suffered and did on the cross and does in heaven. In the second part we showed that the Eastern writer of the eighth century, St. John of Damascus, very briefly referred to the Eucharist as the 'pure' and 'bloodless' 'sacrifice' foretold by the prophet Malachi, of which the shewbread and the offering of Melchizedek were types, and explained at some length that the bread and wine 'become' and 'are transmade into' the Body and Blood of Christ by the power of God exercised in the operation of the Holy Ghost; that no detailed explanations of the Eucharistic sacrifice are found in the West in the Middle Ages, though the tendency of the schoolmen was to connect it with the

cross and death of Christ, and that of the liturgical writers was to associate it more markedly with His heavenly offering; and that, after the controversies of the ninth and following centuries, the change of the substance of the bread and wine into the substance of the Body and Blood of Christ was affirmed by Peter Lombard in the twelfth century in less materialistic language than had previously been used by Cardinal Humbert and others, the bread and the wine were said to be 'transubstantiated' into the Body and Blood of Christ in the decrees of the Fourth Lateran Council (A.D. 1215), and the scholastic doctrine of Transubstantiation was elaborated and explained by St. Thomas Aquinas in the thirteenth century.¹

In this survey of Eucharistic doctrine as taught in the Church down to the thirteenth century, we said nothing about the East after the time of St. John of Damascus, with the exception of a brief reference to a phrase of Euthymius Zigabenus in the twelfth century. Before proceeding further with the history of the doctrine in the West, we must devote some space to the teaching found in the East during the Middle Ages.

X. Theophylact, Euthymius Zigabenus, and Nicolas of Methone may be taken as representative of the Eastern theologians of the eleventh and twelfth centuries; and to some extent they correspond in the East to the schoolmen in the West.

Theophylact was Archbishop of Bulgaria in the latter part of the eleventh and the beginning of the twelfth century. He died in A.D. 1107. His chief writings consist of commentaries on the books of the New Testament. In commenting on the passages which refer to the Holy Eucharist, he shows what was his belief with regard to it.

In the doctrine taught by Theophylact, the death of our Lord on the cross was a sacrifice for sin. 'The death of Christ,' he says, 'was an equivalent for the destruction of all

¹ In the account of the teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas in our number for October last, the word 'retain' on page 108, line 25, should have been 'possess,' and the words 'or produces physical effects' on page 108, line 35, should have been omitted. The writer of the article regrets the carelessness which made him forget that, while St. Thomas Aquinas teaches that the accidents in the consecrated sacrament have the power of nourishing the body, he implies by his connexion of III. lxxvii. 6 with III. lxxvii. 5 of the *Summa Theologica* that this power is possessed by the accidents because, in the act of consecration ('in ipsa consecratione'), it has been by a miracle ('miraculose') attached to the accident of dimensive quantity.

men, and, so far as His act was concerned, He died on behalf of all'; 'He died, bearing our sins, and offering sacrifice (*προσφέρων*) to the Father, that He might blot them out.'¹ By this 'one sacrifice' of 'His own body' which 'Christ offered for our sins,' this 'offering of the body of Christ which was made once for all,' Christians are sanctified.² The 'sacrifice' is 'of such a kind and of so great power that by means of it' Christ 'once for all cleansed the world.'³ The 'object' of His Incarnation was that He might be a high priest.⁴ But His priesthood and the work of it did not end with His death. He entered into heaven for our sake, 'that He might intercede with the Father on our behalf, as also the high priest entered into the sanctuary once in the year making propitiation on behalf of the people.'⁵ 'He entered' into heaven 'with a sacrifice able to appease the Father'; 'He now appears on our behalf,' 'because He entered as high priest, for His entrance took place because of our reconciliation.'⁶ 'He has not ceased to be a priest' because He sits with the dignity of God; His offering is His own body.⁷ In the heavenly intercession which His abiding retention of His Manhood enables Him to offer He 'performs His high priestly work on our behalf.'⁸ His high priesthood after the order of Melchizedek is associated both with the Eucharist on earth in which 'He offers Himself by means of His ministers' and with His intercession in Heaven.⁹ Thus, Christians possess an 'altar' and 'the bloodless sacrifice of the life-giving body' of Christ.¹⁰ In his teaching about the Eucharistic sacrifice, therefore, the position of Theophylact is much the same as that found in the patristic period, an assertion, with little explanation, that the Eucharist is a sacrifice, and an association of it with the death of our Lord and with His priestly work in heaven.

The doctrine of Theophylact about the presence in the Eucharist greatly resembles that of St. John of Damascus. Communion is 'the mystic reception of the Body,' 'the flesh,' 'of the Lord.'¹¹ 'He who eats' Christ is 'transformed' (*μεταστοιχειούμενος*) into Him.¹² The bread and the wine are not 'figures' (*ἀντίτυπον*) of the Body and the Blood of

¹ Theophylact on Heb. ix. 28.

² *Ibid.* x. 10-19.

³ *Ibid.* vii. 27.

⁴ *Ibid.* viii. 11.

⁵ *Ibid.* vi. 20.

⁶ *Ibid.* ix. 24.

⁷ *Ibid.* viii. 1, 3.

⁸ *Ibid.* vii. 25.

⁹ *Ibid.* vii. 3.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* xiii. 10-12. Cf. on 1 Cor. xi. 24-6, where, though *ἀνάμνησις* is apparently interpreted of a remembrance to man, the Eucharist is called a 'sacrifice' (*θυσία*).

¹¹ *Idem* on St. John vi. 27, 48-51.

¹² *Ibid.* vi. 56-8.

our Lord, but the Body and the Blood themselves.¹ 'That which is in the chalice is what flowed from the side' of Christ; 'what the Lord suffered not on the cross (for a bone of Him was not broken), this He now bears, being broken for our sake'; 'as His Body is united to Christ, so also are we united to Him by means of this bread' of the Eucharist.² The bread and the wine are 'transmade' (*μεταποιείται*) and 'changed' (*μεταβάλλεται*) 'by means of the mystic blessing and the descent of the Holy Ghost' into the Body and Blood of Christ.³

Euthymius Zigabenus, also called Zigadenus, was a monk of Constantinople who flourished in the reign of the Emperor Alexius Comnenus. He died about A.D. 1118. His most important works are his *Dogmatic Panoply of the Orthodox Faith* and his commentaries on Holy Scripture.

The teaching of Euthymius on the subject of the Eucharistic Sacrifice closely resembles that of Theophylact. 'Christ,' he says, 'who is king as God, became also priest as Man, when He sacrificed Himself on behalf of the remission of our sins.'⁴ 'He offered Himself as a sacrifice on our behalf, when He delivered Himself up to death.'⁵ So efficacious is this 'one sacrifice' that it avails 'for the remission of all the defilements of sin committed at any time prior to the reception of Baptism.'⁶ Christ was once offered and His sacrifice is all-prevailing.⁷ He entered into heaven on His ascension 'with the sacrifice' which consisted of 'His sacrificed flesh.'⁸ Before His death He had made an offering to the Father in His office as high priest after the order of Melchizedek at the time of His earnest prayer in the agony in the Garden of Gethsemane.⁹ So, too, after His death and resurrection and ascension, His priestly work abides. 'When He had made His offering once for all, He sat down as Lord.'¹⁰ But that glorious possession of high dignity does not hinder His abiding work in heaven as Man and as priest. He is an 'eternal priest'; 'even now He is the representative, as Man, on behalf of our salvation'; 'His Manhood itself beseeches the Father on our behalf';¹¹ 'in heaven He performs the priestly work' of 'intercession' and 'mediation';¹² it is His office, 'as our high priest, to make propitiation'.

¹ Theophylact on St. Matt. xxvi. 28; St. Mark xiv. 22-5; St. John vi. 48-51.

² *Idem* on I Cor. x. 16.

³ *Idem* on St. Matt. xxvi. 28; St. Mark xiv. 22-5; St. John vi. 48-51.

⁴ Euthymius Zigabenus on Heb. vii. 14.

⁵ *Ibid.* vii. 27.

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ *Ibid.* ix. 26.

⁸ *Ibid.* ix. 25.

⁹ *Ibid.* v. 7, 10.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* x. 11, 12.

¹¹ *Ibid.* vii. 25.

¹² *Ibid.* viii. 2, 4, 6.

tion to the Father on our behalf.'¹ In all these acts of 'our high priest' in heaven, there is 'the same Christ' who ever 'offers His bloodless sacrifice'; and, in the Eucharist which Christians 'offer' 'on earth' 'often,' 'there are not many offerings,' but it is ever 'one and the same';² for the Eucharist is 'the mystic sacrifice of the Body of the Lord.'³

With regard to the Presence in the consecrated Sacrament Euthymius follows the lines of thought found in St. John of Damascus. In commenting on our Lord's words at the institution he says :

'He did not say, These are the symbols of My Body and My Blood, but, These are My Body and My Blood. . . . As supernaturally (*ὑπερφύως*) He added deity to (*θεώσας*) the flesh which He took, so ineffably (*ἀπορρήτως*) He transmutes (*μεταποιεῖ*) these into His life-giving Body itself and His precious Blood itself, and into the grace of them (*εἰς τὴν χάριν αὐτῶν*).'⁴

In the *Dogmatic Panoply of the Orthodox Faith* he writes :

'The Body, which was taken from the Holy Virgin, is really (*ἀληθῶς*) united with Godhead, not that the Body which ascended comes down out of heaven, but that the bread itself and the wine are transmade (*μεταποιούνται*) into the Body and Blood of God. If you ask how this comes to pass, it is enough for you to know that it is by means of (*διὰ*) the Holy Ghost, as also the Lord in Himself took (*ὑποστήσατο*) flesh from the holy Mother of God (*θεοτόκου*) by means of (*διὰ*) the Holy Ghost. . . . The bread and the wine and water, by means of the invocation and descent of the Holy Ghost, are supernaturally transmade (*ὑπερφύως μεταποιούνται*) into the Body and the Blood of Christ, and are not two but one and the same.'⁵

In the middle of the twelfth century Soterichus Panteugenus and others asserted that the Eucharistic sacrifice was offered to the Father alone, not to the other Persons of the Holy Trinity. This view was seen to be in conflict with the phrase in the Byzantine Liturgy in which our Lord is addressed in the words, 'Thou art He who dost offer and art offered, who dost receive and art distributed';⁶ and it was condemned at

¹ Euthymius Zigabenus on Heb. ix. 24.

² *Ibid.* x. 3. Both here and in his comment on 1 Cor. xi. 25, Euthymius, like Theophylact, appears to understand *ἀνάμνησις* to denote a remembrance to man; but he clearly regards the Eucharist as a 'sacrifice' (*θυσία*).

³ *Ibid.* xiii. 9.

⁴ *Idem*, In Matt. on xxvi. 28.

⁵ *Idem*, Panop. Dogm. tit. xxv.

⁶ *Liturgy of St. Chrysostom*: see Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, i. 378. In the earlier form of this liturgy as given in the Barberini manuscript of the eighth century the phrase is, 'Thou art He who dost offer and art offered, who dost sanctify and art sanctified'; see Brightman, *op. cit.* i. 318.

a council held at Constantinople under the Emperor Manuel Comnenus in A.D. 1156, which declared that the sacrifice is offered to the Holy Trinity, and that our Lord 'offers sacrifice as Man and receives that which is offered as God (ἱερατεύει μὲν ὡς ἄνθρωπος, δέχεται δὲ τὰ προσφερόμενα ὡς Θεός).'¹

In connexion with this controversy, two short treatises were written in A.D. 1157 by Nicolas, Bishop of Methone, in the Peloponnesus.² In these the opinion of Soterichus is stigmatized as dividing the one Person of Christ, and so leading to Nestorianism; as making a division in the Holy Trinity, and so akin to the error of Tritheism; as denying the equal glory of the Son with the Father and therefore approaching Arianism; and as certain, if these heresies should be avoided, to stumble into Eutychianism. Nicolas throughout assumes that the Eucharist is a sacrifice. He refers to our Lord's death as the sacrifice offered 'once for all,'³ and speaks of Christ in His death on the cross 'offering Himself a living sacrifice.'⁴ He mentions the 'abiding presentation' of 'the blood of salvation' which takes place on 'the heavenly altar' (τὸ ἄνω θυσιαστήριον).⁵ In the Eucharist our Lord 'as Man offers and is offered,' and 'as God, together with the Father and the Spirit, receives His own sacrifice';⁶ and this act of sacrifice is closely connected with the abiding presentation in heaven⁷ and our Lord's heavenly priesthood after the order of Melchizedek.⁸ The sacrifice offered on earth in the Eucharist 'in time' (χρονικῶς) is the same as that offered 'once for all' (ἐφάπαξ) on the cross and 'abidingly' (διαϊωνίως) in heaven.⁹

Incidentally, Nicolas refers to the presence of Christ in the consecrated Sacrament. The bread and wine are 'transformed (μεταστοιχειουμένων) by the operation of the Holy Ghost' into the Body and Blood of Christ;¹⁰ and the Holy Ghost makes 'those who receive these in faith to be of one body with Christ and partakers of Him (συσσώμους καὶ συμμετόχους Χριστοῦ).'¹¹

Among the other works of Nicolas of Methone is that entitled *Against those who doubt, and say that the consecrated bread and wine are not the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus*

¹ See the proceedings of this council in Nicetas of Chonae, *Thesaurus Orth. Fid.* xxiv.

² Published in A.D. 1865 in the edition prefixed to this article.

³ P. 18 and *passim*.

⁴ P. 67.

⁵ Pp. 37, 38.

⁶ Pp. 18, 19 and *passim*.

⁷ P. 18.

⁸ Pp. 48-52.

⁹ P. 53.

¹⁰ P. 51.

¹¹ Pp. 56, 61.

Christ.¹ In this he speaks of 'the mystic and bloodless rite (*ἱερουργία*) in which the bread and the cup when consecrated are transmade (*μεταποιεῖσθαι*) into the Body and Blood of the Lord,'² and refers to the 'object' (*σκοπός*) and 'end' (*τέλος*) of the institution and continuance of the Eucharist being 'participation in Christ' (*μετουσία Χριστοῦ*) and the 'eternal life' of those who thus 'partake' of Him.³ In still stronger language, he asserts the 'reception of the divine nature' (*ἐκθέωσις*) by communicants; and, referring to St. Paul's words to the Corinthians (1 Cor. x. 16, 17), says:

'What is the bread? Indeed, the Body of Christ. What do they who receive it become? Indeed, the Body of Christ. For, by partaking of the Body of Christ, we also become it. For, since our whole flesh was corrupted by sin, we are in need of new flesh.'⁴

Nicolas rests his belief on the power of God, the words of Christ, who is God, and the tradition of the Church. He contends that, if the birth from the Virgin, the resurrection, the ascension, and the other wonders of our Lord's life are believed, there is no ground for disbelieving the 'change' (*μεταβολή*) accomplished in the Eucharist.⁵ He ends his treatise with expressions of horror at the crime of those who deny that the consecrated bread and wine are the 'perfect (*τέλειον*) Body and precious Blood' of Christ, and a prayer that they may be delivered from this error.⁶

Nicolas Cabasilas was Metropolitan of Thessalonica in the middle of the fourteenth century. In the fourth book of his treatise *On Life in Christ*, he expounded at length the completeness of the union with Christ which is the result of the reception of the Holy Eucharist. In his *Explanation of the Holy Liturgy* he dealt very fully with some parts of the doctrine of the Eucharist, and especially with its sacrificial aspect. In the latter book he describes the result of consecration as 'the change of the gifts into the sacred Body and Blood (*ἡ τῶν δώρων εἰς τὸ θεῖον σῶμα καὶ αἷμα μεταβολή*)';⁷ he teaches that this change is accomplished by the work of the Holy Ghost, and that the consecration is effected by the invocation of Him;⁸ he says also that Christ 'sanctifies the gifts and changes them into His Body and Blood,'⁹ that 'God takes the gifts to be His own (*οἰκειοῦται*) in such a way that

¹ Printed in Migne, *P.G.* tom. cxxxv.

² Migne, *op. cit.* col. 509 A.

⁴ *Ibid.* 512 B, C.

⁵ *Ibid.* 513 A.

⁷ Cabasilas, *Sac. Liturg. Interp.* 1.

⁸ *Ibid.* 27. For his strong objection to the Western form of consecration, see 29, 30.

⁶ *Ibid.* 512 A.

⁹ *Ibid.* 517 A.

⁹ *Ibid.* 49.

He makes them the Body and Blood of the Only-begotten Son,' and 'receives our bread and wine and gives back to us the Son Himself.'¹

Cabasilas regards the various actions of the Liturgy as connected with the stages of Christ's life; and the whole rite is viewed by Him as a great act of sacrifice in which there is a commemoration² in the Church and before God of the human life of our Lord. The sacrifice of Christ was once offered on the cross, but He has not ceased from His priestly work, and exercises an abiding ministry on our behalf as a priest for ever.³ In His work of intercession He unites man with Himself, and this means of reconciliation is in the Eucharist,⁴ which is not a figure or symbol of a sacrifice but really a sacrifice, in which that which is offered in sacrifice is the Body of Christ, and in which the moment of sacrifice is when the bread and wine are changed into the Body and Blood.⁵ This sacrifice is offered in prayer for the living and the departed, and in thanksgiving for the saints;⁶ it sanctifies by way of intercession both the dead and the living, by way of communion the living only.⁷ It is offered to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; and in it our Lord offers and is offered and receives the sacrifice.⁸ It is a proclamation of our Lord's death and resurrection and ascension.⁹ It is the commemoration, not of the Saviour as working miracles, but of Him as crucified and dying, of the cross and all that follows the cross.¹⁰ On the cross and in the Eucharist there is one sacrifice;¹¹ and in the Eucharist there is to be seen in mystery the whole incarnate life of the Son of God, for

'In the sacred rite of the Eucharist the whole Incarnation of Christ is written in the bread as on a writing tablet; for as in a figure we behold Him as a babe, and led to death, and crucified, and pierced in His side; then also the bread itself changed (*μεταβαλλόμενον*) into that all-holy Body which really endured this, and rose from the dead, and was taken up into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father.'¹²

There is a strong element of mysticism in the doctrinal teaching of Cabasilas; and the great importance he attaches

¹ Cabasilas, *Sac. Liturg. Interp.* 47.

² Cabasilas, like earlier writers, takes *ἀνάμνησις* to denote a remembrance to man: see especially chapter 9. He, however, regards that which Christians thus remember as being also a commemoration before God.

³ *Ibid.* 2, 8, 28.

⁶ *Ibid.* 33.

⁹ *Ibid.* 1, 16.

¹² *Ibid.* 37: cf. 6, 8.

⁴ *Ibid.* 44.

⁷ *Ibid.* 42.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* 7, 50.

⁵ *Ibid.* 32.

⁸ *Ibid.* 49.

¹¹ *Ibid.* 32.

to the symbolical actions in the Liturgy corresponds with this. His central ideas of the Eucharist are that, in reception, it is the communication of the life of Christ; and that, as sacrifice, it is the presentation by the Church to the Holy Trinity of the Lord who has passed through death and is alive for evermore, into whose Body and Blood the bread and the wine are changed by the operation of the Holy Ghost.

In the Definition of the Council of Florence, assented to in A.D. 1439 by the representatives of the Eastern Church, an incidental reference was made to the effect of consecration in making the bread to be the Body of Christ, and it was affirmed that the Eucharistic Sacrifice benefits those departed souls who have died in penitence, but without completing the needed satisfaction for their sins.¹

XI. It has been mentioned in the second part of this article that the positive teaching of Peter Lombard and St. Thomas Aquinas on the sacrifice of the Mass is scanty. But two hints thrown out by these two writers, almost as *obiter dicta*, had a great influence on the development of the doctrine of the sacrifice in the West. Peter Lombard suggested that the reason for the institution of the Sacrament in two kinds was that 'the bread is concerned with the flesh, the wine with the soul,'² and made a brief passing statement that 'the fraction is the representation of the passion and death of Christ.'³ St. Thomas Aquinas, in the course of his discussion on sacrifice in general, answered an objection to the statement that a sacrifice is an act of a specific kind by saying:

'Sacrifices are properly so called when something is done with regard to things offered to God, as that animals were slain and burned, or that bread is broken and eaten and blessed. And this the name itself signifies; for a sacrifice is so called because man

¹ *Def. Conc. Florent.* Hardouin, *Concilia*, ix. 421, 422. The phrase by which the Eucharistic Sacrifice is denoted is in the Greek text *τὰς ἁγίας θυσίας*, 'the holy sacrifices,' in the Latin text 'missarum sacrificia,' 'the sacrifices of the Masses.' For an account of the Council of Florence from an Eastern point of view, see *The History of the Council of Florence*, translated from the Russian by Basil Popoff, edited by Dr. Neale (London, 1861). In the decree of Pope Eugenius IV. in connexion with the Armenians, he uses the ordinary Western language of the time, that 'the substance of the bread is changed into the Body of Christ, and the substance of the wine into His Blood, yet in such a way that the whole Christ is contained under the species of bread, and the whole Christ under the species of wine, and the whole Christ is also under any part whatever of the consecrated host and the consecrated wine when a division is made in them:' see *Decret. Eugen. IV.* Hardouin, *Concilia*, ix. 439 D.

² Peter Lombard, *Sent.* IV. xi. 6.

³ *Ibid.* IV. xii. 6.

makes something sacred. But an offering is directly so called when something is offered to God, even if nothing is done with regard to it; as money or bread is said to be offered on the altar, with regard to which nothing is done. Wherefore every sacrifice is an offering, but not every offering a sacrifice. Now first fruits are offerings, because they were offered to God, as we read in Deuteronomy xxvi.; but they are not sacrifices, because nothing sacred was done with regard to them.¹

Dr. Vacant has pointed out that Alexander of Hales, in the thirteenth century, 'threw out as a passing thought' the idea that 'the consecration in two kinds was a representation of the separation of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ on Calvary;' but that, while the theologians of the thirteenth century as a rule 'continued to see an image of the Passion in the liturgical rites ordained by the Church,' Alexander of Hales stood alone in this carrying out of the suggestion hinted at by Peter Lombard with regard to the twofold consecration.² This idea was adopted in incidental statements by St. Thomas Aquinas, who, moreover, associated the sacrifice with the consecration, in which the priest, he teaches, is representative of Christ as he is of the Church in the prayers in general:

'In the Passion of Christ the Blood was separated from the Body, and therefore in this Sacrament, which is the memorial of the Passion of the Lord, the bread is taken separately as the Sacrament of the Body, and the wine as the Sacrament of the Blood;'³

'The priest is representative of Christ, in whose person and power he utters the words of consecration. . . . And so there is a sense in which the priest and victim are the same;'⁴

'In the Mass, the priest speaks in the prayers in the person of the Church . . . ; but in the consecration of the Sacrament he speaks in the person of Christ.'⁵

The suggestions thus made, without any detailed discussion of them, by Peter Lombard, Alexander of Hales, and St. Thomas Aquinas, had an important influence on the later history of the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice in the West.

A little later than St. Thomas Aquinas, at the end of the

¹ St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, II². lxxxv. 3, ad 3.

² Vacant, *Histoire de la Conception du Sacrifice de la Messe dans l'Eglise Latine*, pp. 36-38. The passage in Alexander of Hales is *Universae Theologiae Summa*, IV. x. 2 (2).

³ St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, III. lxxiv. 1; cf. lxxvi. 2, ad 1, lxxviii. 3, ad 2, ad 7, lxxx. 12, ad 3.

⁴ *Ibid.* III. lxxxiii. 1, ad 3; cf. lxxviii. 1, lxxxii. 1, 3.

⁵ *Ibid.* III. lxxxii. 7, ad 3.

thirteenth and the beginning of the fourteenth century, was the teaching of John Duns Scotus. It was opposed to that of St. Thomas Aquinas in many matters of widely varying importance;¹ and, in particular, it differed in minute and subtle points about the Eucharist. The tendency of his statements is to make the sacrificial action wider than the consecration taken by itself,² and he regarded the officiating priest as acting in the capacity of the minister of the whole Church.³

As in other matters, Duns Scotus had many followers in his teaching about the Eucharist. A clear statement of the position of the Scotists and a severe judgment upon it may be seen in the paper by Dr. Vacant, to which we have already referred more than once. It is there said:

'According to Duns Scotus, although the God-Man is the principal Priest of the Mass, He does not directly co-operate; for each Mass is not only applied but also celebrated not by an act of His will, but by an act of the will of the individual priests.

'The Scotists developed this doctrine. They maintained that Jesus Christ is the Priest in the Eucharistic Sacrifice only because He instituted it and conferred on His priests the power to offer it. They derived from this theory two important consequences. The first was that the priests who celebrate are not the ministers and organs of Jesus Christ Himself; but that they offer the sacrifice in the name of, and in dependence on, the Church, to which the Saviour has entrusted it. The second is that the Mass is not an act of the God-Man, that it has not the same value as the sacrifice of the cross, that it only applies part of the benefits of the sacrifice of the cross, and that this application is made by reason of the prayer of the Church and not by reason of an actual offering of the consecrated victim by Jesus Christ Himself.

'This was to deny that the sacrifice of the Mass reproduces the sacrifice of the cross, either in itself or in its effects; it was to prepare the spirit of the doctrines of Protestantism.'⁴

Without minimizing the differences between St. Thomas Aquinas and Duns Scotus,⁵ and between the Thomists and the Scotists, it may be questioned whether this judgment of Dr. Vacant is altogether just. It may be the case that Scotus, and the Scotists subsequently, were struggling after

¹ There is a table of the most important differences in Stone, *Outlines of Christian Dogma*, p. 336.

² Duns Scotus, *Sent.* IV. xiii. 2. For his discussion of the relation of the words 'This is My Body,' 'This is My Blood,' to the consecration, see IV. viii. 1.

³ *Idem*, *Quæst. Quodlib.* xx.

⁴ Vacant, *op. cit.* pp. 48, 49.

⁵ There are some matters of interest in the discussion in Renz, *Die Geschichte des Messopfer-Begriffs*, i. 785-99.

some statement about the Mass which should maintain that it is a sacrifice, and should, at the same time, protect the unique character of our Lord's death on the cross, and allow for the truth that the Eucharistic offering is the act, not of the one priest who celebrates, but of the whole Church.¹ The extent to which the patristic doctrine of the connexion of the Eucharistic sacrifice with the action of our Lord in heaven had fallen out of sight in the West in the Middle Ages deprived them of the key to their difficulties which would have enabled them to do this without disconnecting the action of the priest on earth from that of our Lord.

It cannot be ascertained that the later Middle Ages added much to the development of the doctrine of the sacrifice of the Mass. That the Eucharist is a sacrifice appears to have been universally held. In what way it is a sacrifice seems to have been regarded as a question on which the Church had not defined, about which theologians might dispute and hold different opinions.

XII. At the close of the Middle Ages, those who believed the traditional teaching of the theologians of the Church that the Eucharist is a sacrifice entered into a period of controversy at great disadvantage in several respects.

1. In the first place, the connexion of the Eucharist with the heavenly offering of our Lord had long been out of sight in the West. The fact that the schoolmen had not incorporated into their systems this part of the Theology of the Fathers and of some liturgical writers of the Middle Ages naturally led to its being ignored by those upon whom their influence was great. Consequently, so far as the two truths that there is only one sacrifice of Christ, and that the Eucharist is a sacrifice, find their consistency with one another in the relation of the Eucharistic sacrifice to the sacrifice of our Lord in heaven as His abiding presentation to the Father of His living Manhood which has passed through death, the position of those who wished to maintain the traditional doctrine of the Church had been undermined by this loss.

2. Secondly, the idea of destruction as a necessary element in sacrifice, which had been imported into the mediæval theology by the sentence of St. Thomas Aquinas which has been quoted, and which in consequence came to be a part of the

¹ It should not be forgotten that Peter Lombard had written (though in supporting the usually rejected position that an heretical or excommunicated priest cannot validly consecrate), 'No one says in the act of consecration, I offer, but, We offer, as though speaking in the person of the Church' ('Nemo dicit in ipsa consecratione, Offero, sed Offerimus, quasi ex persona ecclesiae'), *Sent.* IV. xiii. 1.

traditional Thomist theory, cramped and limited the notion of sacrifice to an extent which had not previously been the case.

3. Thirdly, the belief expressed very clearly by, among others, St. Gregory the Great,¹ that specific results are the direct outcome of the offering of the Eucharistic sacrifice had been narrowed and hardened by some into a mechanical theory of fixed and certain effect, such as, when controversies arose, writers who held so strongly to the main lines of the traditional Catholic theory as the Dominican Melchior Canus² and Cardinal Cajetan³ thought it necessary to repudiate.

4. Fourthly, a theory had arisen, probably less widely held and less influential than the mechanical ideas of the effects of the mere offering of the sacrifice, which dissociated the Eucharist from the action of our Lord on Calvary by describing the sacrifice of the cross as for original sin and the sacrifice of the Mass, as a separate and parallel act, as for actual sin. It was supposed by some that this view had the authority of St. Thomas Aquinas and his teacher, Albert the Great. The treatise *On the Venerable Sacrament of the Altar*, which was printed with the works of St. Thomas Aquinas, and a sermon ascribed to Albert the Great contained the passage:

'The second reason for the institution of this Sacrament is the sacrifice of the altar, against a certain daily ravage of our sins; so that, as the Body of the Lord was once offered on the cross for original sin, so it is offered in a parallel way (jugiter) for our daily sins on the altar, and in this the Church has the precious and acceptable office of appeasing God beyond all sacraments or sacrifices of the law.'⁴

It is certain that the theory in question was not held by either St. Thomas Aquinas or Albert the Great; it is almost certain that the treatise and the sermon from which the above quotation is made were not rightly ascribed to them; there is a possibility that the passage itself was only an awkwardly expressed statement not intended to bear any such meaning as that placed upon it.⁵ Nevertheless, the existence of this

¹ See part ii. of this article, October 1901, p. 93.

² Melchior Canus, *De Loc. Theol.* XII. xiii. 11.

³ Cajetan, *Quæst. atque Quodlib.* (*De Sac. Euch.*).

⁴ *De venerabili Sac. Altaris*, ap. St. Thomas Aquinas, *Opuscula*, xxi. (al. lviii.); Albert the Great, *De Sacros. Euch. Sac. Serm.* i.

⁵ On these points, see Vacant, *op. cit.*, pp. 40-42, note; *Revue Anglo-Romaine*, i. 400-409, ii. 252-260, 302-308, iii. 723-730; *Church Quarterly Review*, April 1896, pp. 41, 42.

view and the possibility afforded by this passage of associating it with two great names were influential circumstances.¹

Catherinus was a Dominican writer of the first half of the sixteenth century, who became Bishop of Minori in A.D. 1547 and Archbishop of Conza in A.D. 1551. It may be doubted whether the Jesuits Vasquez and Suarez and the Dominican Melchior Canus were right in ascribing to him a theory making the sacrifice of the altar a distinct sacrifice, instituted for different purposes, from the sacrifice of Calvary, which they stigmatize as 'clearly absurd,' 'plainly contrary to the Catholic faith,'² 'a mad dream,'³ and inconsistent with the doctrine which rests upon Scripture, tradition, and reason alike.⁴ That he should, at any rate, have come perilously near to it, and have been charged with it by competent theologians, may afford an additional illustration to that supplied by the passage ascribed to Albert the Great and St. Thomas Aquinas of the notion of the separation of that which is done at the altar from that which our Lord did on the cross.

XIII. Whether or not it was the design of Pope Innocent III. and the Lateran Council of A.D. 1215 to make acceptance of the doctrine of Transubstantiation obligatory in the Western Church,⁵ the practical issue of the work of the Pope and the Council, subsequently aided by the teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas, was that the affirmation of Transubstantiation came to be regarded as the right and necessary way of expressing the belief that the consecrated bread and wine are the Body and Blood of Christ. This state of affairs, however, did not escape protest. A significant instance is afforded by the Dominican writer John of Paris about A.D. 1300. The position taken up by this divine was not simply a revival, as has sometimes been thought, of the teaching set out in the twelfth century by Rupert of Deutz, who had maintained the continued existence of the substance of the bread and wine on the grounds that it is not the method of the Holy Ghost to destroy and of the analogy of the Incarnation.⁶ The attitude of John of Paris was distinctly nearer to

¹ See Kidd, *The Later Mediæval Doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice*, pp. 58-103.

² Vasquez, *Comm. in 3 p. S. Thom.* lxxxiii. 1, disp. ccxxi. cap. 4.

³ Melchior Canus, *De Loc. Theol.* XII. xiii. 11.

⁴ Suarez, *In 3 p. S. Thom.* lxxxiii. 1, disp. lxxix. sect. i. See also Cajetan, *op. cit.*

⁵ See part ii. of this article, October 1901, p. 107.

⁶ Rupert of Deutz, *De Trin. et Operibus ejus: In Exod.* ii. 10. Cf. the attack on Rupert in Bellarmine, *De Sacr. Euch.* iii. 11, 15. It should be remembered that some theologians who asserted the change (con-

acceptance of the doctrine current in his time. In his treatise *On the Presence of the Body of Christ in the Sacrament of the Altar* he wrote:

'I intend to defend the real and true presence (veram existentiam et realem) of the Body of Christ in the Sacrament of the altar, and that it is not there only as by way of sign (sicut in signo). And though I hold and approve the solemn opinion that the Body of Christ is in the Sacrament of the altar by means of the conversion of the substance of the bread into it itself (in ipsum), and that the accidents remain there without a subject, yet I do not dare to say that this is of faith (quod hoc cadat sub fide); but the real and actual presence (vera et realis existentia) of the Body of Christ in the Sacrament of the altar can be securely held otherwise (potest aliter salvari). Nevertheless, I solemnly declare, that if it be shown that the aforesaid method has been positively affirmed (determinatum) by a sacred canon, or by the Church, or by a General Council, or by the Pope, whose power is that of the whole Church (qui virtute continet totam Ecclesiam), I do not wish anything I say accounted as said, and am ready to recall it at once. And if it has not yet been positively affirmed, but it shall come to be so affirmed, I am ready to assent to it at once.'¹

'For the substance of the bread to remain under its own accidents in the Sacrament of the altar can be understood in two ways. First, the substance of the bread may be held to remain in the Sacrament of the altar under its own accidents in a subject of its own (in proprio subjecto); and this is untrue, because in this case there would not be association of properties (communicatio idiomatum) between the Bread and the Body of Christ, nor would it be true to say, The bread is the Body of Christ, or "My flesh is really (vere) food." Secondly, the substance of the bread may be held to remain under its own accidents, not in a subject of its own (non in proprio supposito), but in relation to the being and subject of Christ (tracta ad esse et suppositum Christi), so that in this way there would be one subject in the two natures. And this is true.'²

This treatise of John apparently expressed the opinion of other divines at Paris besides himself.³ It was, however, condemned by the Bishop of Paris, who deprived John of the professorship which he held. On this deprivation he had

versio) of the substance of the bread and the wine into the Body and Blood of Christ denied that this involved the destruction of the substance of the bread and the wine; see e.g. St. Thomas Aquinas, *S.T.* III. lxxv. 3.

¹ John of Paris, *Determinatio de modo existendi Corp. Christi in Sacramento Altaris alio quam sit ille quem tenet Ecclesia*, pp. 85, 86 (edition of 1686).

² *Ibid.* p. 86. The view of John of Paris was stigmatized as heresy by Bellarmine, *op. cit.* iii. 11, 16.

³ John of Paris, *op. cit.* p. 97.

determined to appeal to Pope Clement V.; but died in A.D. 1306 before he had done so.

A little later than John of Paris, Durandus of St. Pourçain, also a Dominican, without very definitely opposing the ordinary form of the doctrine of Transubstantiation, expressed as his own opinion a theory differing from it; and he regarded the question of the method of the change of the substance of the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ as open. This Durandus, who is to be distinguished from the two Bishops of Mende of the same name in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, was a professor of theology in the University of Paris, afterwards Bishop of Puy-en-Velay, and then of Meaux. He died in A.D. 1333. In his treatise on the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard he asserted the 'change (*conversio*) of the substance' of the bread and the wine into the Body and Blood of Christ as true and as taught by the Church, though he allowed that other methods of the presence of the Body of Christ in the consecrated Sacrament are, in the abstract, possible.¹ On the way in which this 'change of the substance' is brought about, he wrote,

'Saving a better judgment, it can be thought that, if in this Sacrament there comes to pass a change (*conversio*) of the substance of the bread into the Body of Christ, this takes place in this way, that the form of the bread ceases to be (*quod corrupta forma panis*), but the matter of the bread is under the form of the Body of Christ (*materia ejus sit sub forma corporis Christi*) suddenly and by the power of God, as the matter of nourishment is under the form of the person nourished by the power of nature. . . . Now it is clear that the aforesaid method of the change (*conversio*) of the substance of the bread into the Body of Christ is possible; but the other method which is commonly held is unintelligible; neither has either of these been more approved or condemned by the Church than the other.'²

William of Occam, a native of Ockham in Surrey, known as the 'Invincible Doctor,' was a member of the Franciscan Order. Like John of Paris and Durandus of St. Pourçain, he was a professor of theology in the University of Paris. In A.D. 1322 he became the English Provincial of the Franciscans. From A.D. 1328 to A.D. 1347, when he died, he took refuge from the hostility of Pope John XXII. at the court of Lewis, the King of Bavaria. In philosophy he was a Nominalist. Of his general theological position it has been said by a writer of genius,

'Occam discusses many questions, and the conclusions which he establishes do not form a consistent system; but we see certain

¹ Durandus of St. Pourçain, *In Sent. Lomb.* IV. xi. 1.

² *Ibid.* IV. xi. 3 (5).

principles which he stoutly maintains. He is opposed to the Papal claims to temporal monarchy and spiritual infallibility. Moreover, he shows a remarkable tendency to assert the authority of Scripture as the supreme arbiter of all questions in the Church. The Pope may err; a General Council may err; the Fathers and Doctors of the Church are not entirely exempt from error. Only Holy Scripture and the beliefs of the Universal Church are of absolute validity. Occam seems to be groping after what is eternal in the faith of the Church, that he may mark it clearly off from what is of human ordinance and concerns only the temporary needs of the ecclesiastical system.¹

It was from such a point of view that William of Occam examined the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist. On this subject he claimed that he had no intention of diverging from the current doctrine taught at Rome. He appears to have departed from his general principle of the absolute validity of the teaching of Holy Scripture and the universal Church alone on the ground of a supposed revelation of the doctrine of Transubstantiation to the Church at some later time than the period of the Fathers. Thus, while he allows that there is nothing in the New Testament which is inconsistent with the continuance of the substance of the bread and the wine after consecration, and that, apart from any decision of the Church, it would be reasonable to suppose that it does so continue to be, and that differing opinions on this point have from of old been held within the Church, he adds the definite statement:

'The substance of the bread and the wine ceases to be, and the accidents alone remain, and under them the Body of Christ begins to be. This is clear to the Church by some revelation, as I suppose; and therefore the Church has so decided (determinavit).'²

In spite of his general principles, then, William of Occam accepted the ordinary teaching of his day in the Western Church, that in the consecrated elements the substance of the bread and the wine has been changed into the Body of Christ, and that of the bread and the wine only the accidents remain, on the ground of Church authority. That he could do so, and at the same time maintain the conformity with reason of the opinion of the continued existence of the substance of the bread and the wine in the consecrated sacrament, was the more possible because of the depreciation

¹ Creighton, *History of the Papacy*, i. 41 (edition of 1897).

² Occam, *Quodlib. Sept.* iv. 34, 35.

of human reason which characterized the thought of his school.¹

The latter half of the fourteenth century was marked by the teaching of John Wyclif, at one time Master of Balliol, and later the incumbent of several benefices in succession, of which the last was the rectory of Lutterworth in Leicestershire, where, after ten years' residence, he died in A.D. 1384. Like Occam, Wyclif had a mind of the scholastic type. Unlike him, he was a Realist. Both divines agreed in assigning the highest value to the authority of Holy Scripture. Wyclif went far beyond Occam in his rejection of the authority of the Church.

The most notable feature in the teaching of Wyclif was his doctrine of 'dominion.' The maxim that 'dominion is founded in grace' was made the starting-point of a theory that, since every temporal or spiritual possession is the gift of God, and since no one whom mortal sin excludes from a state of grace is capable of receiving any gift from God, therefore the bishop or priest who is in mortal sin can perform no spiritual action, and the proprietor who is similarly out of a state of grace does not really own his estate. Closely connected with this theory was his denial of the ordinary doctrine of the visible Church and his affirmation that the Church consists of those who will ultimately be saved.

These theoretical positions and his attacks on the ecclesiastical system and the morals of the Pope, bishops, and clergy, led Wyclif to the consideration and discussion of the doctrine of the Eucharist. He does not appear to have denied that the word Transubstantiation might be used in an innocent sense. He affirmed repeatedly that the Body of Christ is present in the consecrated sacrament. The current doctrine that the substance of the bread and the wine is changed at the consecration into the Body of Christ, so that after consecration the substance of the bread and the wine no longer exists, but the Body of Christ is the only substance and is present and is received with the accidents of the bread and the wine, he vehemently rejected.

In A.D. 1381 Wyclif published a series of statements on the subject of the Holy Eucharist. It contained twelve propositions, of which the most important are the following :

¹ See Gieseler, *Compendium of Ecclesiastical History*, iv. 170, 171 (English translation). For a view that Occam represented his real opinions as theological experiments and that his apparent agreement with the ordinary Church teaching of his time was only a device see Harnack, *History of Dogma*, vi. 165 (English translation).

'The consecrated Host, which we see on the altar, is neither Christ nor any part of Him, but an effectual sign (*efficax signum*) of Him.'

'The Eucharist has, by virtue of the sacramental words, both the Body and the Blood of Christ really and actually (*vere et realiter*) in every part of it.'

'Transubstantiation, identification, and impanation . . . are not to be established from Scripture (*fundabiles in scriptura*).'

'It is contrary to the opinions of saints to assert that there is accident without subject in the true Host.'

'The Sacrament of the Eucharist is in its nature bread and wine, containing, by virtue of the sacramental words, the real (*verum*) Body and Blood of Christ in every part of it.'

'The Sacrament of the Eucharist is in figure the Body and Blood of Christ, into which the bread and wine are transubstantiated, of which some being (*aliquitas*) remains after consecration, although, as the faithful believe, laid asleep (*licet quoad considerationem fidelium sit sopita*).'

'The existence of accident without subject is not tenable.'¹

A little later, Wyclif made the declaration known as his 'Confession.' In it he said:

'I have often confessed, and do still confess, that the bread in the Sacrament, or consecrated Host, which the faithful perceive in the hands of the priest, is really and actually (*vere et realiter*) the same body of Christ numerically (*idem corpus Christi in numero*) and the same substance as was taken from the Virgin and as suffered on the cross and lay dead in the tomb for the holy three days, and rose on the third day, and after forty days ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father. The proof of this is, that Christ, who cannot lie, so declares. Nevertheless, I do not dare to say that this bread is the Body of Christ essentially, or substantially, or corporally, or identically (*essentialiter, substantialiter, corporaliter, vel identice*). . . For we believe that there is a threefold way in which the Body of Christ is in the consecrated Host—namely, virtual, spiritual, and sacramental. Virtual, whereby throughout His whole rule He benefits in the good things of nature and grace. The spiritual way is that whereby the Body of Christ is in the Eucharist and in the saints by means of grace. And the third way, the sacramental, is that whereby the Body of Christ is in the consecrated Host after a unique manner (*singulariter*). . . But, besides these three ways of being, there are three other ways more true and more actual (*realiores et veriores*) which the Body of Christ fitly has in heaven—namely, the way of being substantially, corporally, and by dimension (*substantialiter, corporaliter, et dimensionaliter*). And men of gross ideas understand no other way of the being of a natural [*naturalis: al. material, materialis*] substance besides these. But they are not at all fit to grasp the mystery of the Eucharist and the subtlety of Scripture.'²

¹ *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, p. 105.

² *Ibid.* pp. 115-117.

In another part of this 'Confession,' Wyclif, as in his earlier propositions, repudiated the idea of 'accident without subject'—that is the existence of the accidents of the bread and wine without their natural substance; and affirmed that there is 'real (verus) bread and wine' in the consecrated Sacrament.¹

The statements of belief ascribed to Wyclif at the Council of London of A.D. 1382 appear to represent his teaching accurately. Among them were the following:

'The substance of the material bread and wine remains in the Sacrament of the altar after consecration.'

'The accidents do not remain without a subject in the same Sacrament after consecration.'

'Christ is not in the Sacrament of the altar identically, really, and actually, in a proper bodily presence (identice, vere, et realiter in propria praesentia corporali).'

'If a bishop or a priest is in mortal sin, he does not ordain, or consecrate, or baptize.'²

Of Wyclif's final position it has been lately said:

'In' 'the *De Eucharistia* and *De Apostasia*' 'he was chiefly concerned to prove that the sacramental elements remained unchanged in substance after consecration: the order of nature was not set aside by special miracle, but Christ's Body was also there by supernatural grace. . . . The vehemence of his constantly repeated protests against the pretension to "annihilate the substance of the bread" by the priest's words of consecration would be hard to understand if it were a question only of the philosophical terms to be employed. But to his mind the adoration of the Host was pushed to idolatrous extremes, and strengthened the hold of superstition on credulous and ignorant fancy. It was clearly connected in his thought with the extravagance of sacerdotal claims, with the impostures and the mercenary claims which he denounced so strongly in the ecclesiastical system of his times, and in the widely extended practices of the Masses for the dead.'³

Wyclif's statements that the Body of Christ is not present in the consecrated Sacrament 'essentially, or substantially, or corporally, or identically,' or 'identically, really, and actually, in a proper bodily presence,' and that 'the Sacrament of the Eucharist is in figure the Body and Blood of Christ,' have often been understood as meaning that the consecrated bread and wine are only symbols of the Body and Blood and not the Body and Blood of Christ themselves. It is probably a truer

¹ *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, p. 131.

² Council of London (A.D. 1382), Hardouin, *Concilia*, vii. 1890, 1891.

³ Capes, *The English Church in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries*, p. 120.

interpretation of his meaning and purpose that he was endeavouring in a scholastic fashion to find a way of asserting the real presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the consecrated Sacrament, and of, at the same time, distinguishing the way in which Christ is present on the altar from that in which He is present in heaven, and, also, of avoiding what seemed to him the insuperable logical contradictions of the current explanations; ¹ and that his phraseology respecting the Eucharist as being 'in figure' the Body of Christ is parallel to the method of expression by which St. Ambrose contrasted the 'shadow' ('umbra') of the Jewish Law, the 'symbol' ('imago') of Christian worship, and the 'reality' ('veritas') which is in heaven. ²

The 'confession' and subsequent explanation of Sir John Oldcastle, made in A.D. 1413, are of some interest. In them Oldcastle declared his belief that

'the most worshipful Sacrament of the altar is Christ's Body in form of bread, the same Body that was born of the Blessed Virgin, our Lady Saint Mary, done on the cross, dead and buried, the third day rose from death to life, the which Body is now glorified in heaven'; ³

and that in the Eucharist there are both 'the real (verum) Body of Christ' and 'real (verus) bread.' ⁴

In the early part of the fifteenth century, the influence of the opinions of Wyclif in Bohemia was great. But it appears to have been less with regard to the Holy Eucharist than with regard to other matters. John Hus, while agreeing with Wyclif on many subjects, seems to have maintained belief in the current form of the doctrine of Transubstantiation; ⁵ and it is doubtful whether the charges brought against Jerome of Prague of denying both it and the presence of Christ in the Sacrament were true. ⁶

In Germany, about half a century later, John Wessel, who was born in A.D. 1429 and died in A.D. 1489, in early life a Realist, afterwards a Nominalist, so far departed from the current doctrine that he does not appear to have recognized

¹ See, e.g., *Triologus*, iv. 1-10.

² See part i. of this article, July 1901, p. 358, note².

³ *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, p. 438; Wilkins, *Concilia*, iii. 354. The confession was in English. The spelling has been modernized above.

⁴ *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, p. 444; Wilkins, *Concilia*, iii. 356; Hardouin, *Concilia*, viii. 206.

⁵ See Robertson, *History of the Christian Church*, vii. 309, 322, 356, 370.

⁶ See Hagenbach, *History of Christian Doctrines*, ii. 361 (English Translation).

any essential difference between the presence of Christ in the consecrated Sacrament and that which may be found elsewhere; and his teaching that he who believes eats the Body of Christ without Communion was apparently intended in a very different sense from the phrase in the mediæval office books by which, following the words of St. Augustine,¹ the priest was directed to say to a sick man who was unable to receive Communion, 'Brother, in this case real faith is sufficient for thee, and good intention; only believe, and thou hast eaten.'² For his treatise *On the Sacrament of the Eucharist* contains the following passages:

'Expressly must the word of the Lord be observed, "Except ye shall have eaten, ye will not have life in you." But they who believe in Him have real (veram) life. Therefore, they who believe in Him are those who eat His flesh.'³

'Wheresoever His Name is blessed . . . there is He really (vere) present not only with His Godhead and goodwill, but also corporally. . . . I do not say that it is granted to every Christian man that he can have Christ sacramentally present by means of the Eucharist whenever he wishes; for this is granted to priests only. But I say that the Lord Jesus is really (vere) present to one calling on His Name, really (vere) present, not only with His deity but also with His flesh and blood and whole humanity. For who will doubt that the Lord Jesus is often corporally present to His faithful ones in their agonies, though His session at the right hand of the Father is not abandoned because of this? Who will doubt that this can happen simultaneously in such a way (ita) outside the Eucharist as (sicut) in the Eucharist?'⁴

'So did the Magdalen eat of Him when she sat at the feet of Jesus, when first she loved much. . . . So to partake of His flesh and blood, is rather to eat than if ten thousand times we should receive the Eucharist at the altar from the hand of the priest with a dry heart and a cold will, even though in a state of salvation.'⁵

XIV. Throughout the period from the thirteenth century to the beginning of the sixteenth, the attempts of individuals to find or assert a doctrine of the presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist other than that usually held were met with stern repression by the authorities of the Western Church. In the early years of the fourteenth century, John of Paris, as has been already stated, was deprived of his professorship by the Bishop of Paris for a guarded questioning of the

¹ St. Augustine, *In Joan. Ev. Tract.* xxvi. 1.

² See Maskell, *Monumenta Ritualia*, i. 89 (edition of 1846). For the 'symbolical Communion' of the Middle Ages, see Pullan, *History of the Book of Common Prayer*, p. 236.

³ John Wessel, *De Sacr. Euch.* p. 10.

⁴ *Ibid.* 24.

⁵ *Ibid.* 28.

doctrine that the substance of the bread and wine does not remain in the consecrated Sacrament. In A.D. 1381, in the controversy with Wyclif, the University of Oxford made a solemn declaration that,

'By the sacramental words, duly pronounced by a priest, the bread and wine on the altar are transubstantiated or substantially changed (*convertuntur*) into the real (*verum*) Body and Blood of Christ, so that after consecration there do not remain in the venerable Sacrament the material bread and wine, which were there before, in the two substances or natures, but only in the species of the same, under which species the real (*verum*) Body and Blood of Christ are actually contained (*realiter continentur*), not only symbolically or figuratively (*figurative seu tropice*), but essentially, substantially, and corporally, in such a way that Christ is really (*veraciter*) there in His own proper bodily presence.'¹

In A.D. 1382 the Council of London condemned as not only 'erroneous' but also 'heretical' the statements ascribed to Wyclif to the effect that 'the substance of the bread and the wine remain in the consecrated Sacrament'; that 'the accidents do not remain without a subject'; that 'Christ is not present identically, really, and actually in a proper bodily presence (*identice, vere, et realiter in propria praesentia corporali*)'; and that the Sacraments administered by a bishop or priest in mortal sin are not valid.²

In A.D. 1413 Archbishop Arundel of Canterbury delivered to Sir John Oldcastle a statement of doctrine declared to be obligatory in which it was said,

'The faith and the determination of Holy Church touching the Blissful Sacrament of the altar is this, that after the sacramental words be said by a priest in his Mass, the material bread that was before is turned into Christ's very Body, and the material wine that was before is turned into Christ's very Blood, and so there leaveth on the altar no material bread, nor material wine, the which were there before the saying of the sacramental words.'³

In A.D. 1415 and 1416 the Council of Constance included the statements about the Holy Eucharist ascribed to Wyclif by the Council of London of A.D. 1382 in the list of propositions which it condemned;⁴ asserted that 'the whole Body

¹ *Definitio facta per Cancellarium et Doctores Universitatis Oxoniensis de Sacr. Altaris* A.D. 1381, Lyndwood, *Provinciale*, p. 59 (ii.) (edition of 1679).

² Council of London of A.D. 1382, Hardouin, *Concilia*, vii. 1890, 1891.

³ *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, pp. 441, 442; Wilkins, *Concilia*, iii. 355. This statement was in English. The spelling has been modernized above.

⁴ Hardouin, *Concilia*, viii. 299, 302; cf. 909, 915.

and Blood of Christ are really (veraciter) contained under the species of bread as well as under the species of wine ;¹ placed the statements ascribed to Wyclif among those which Jerome of Prague was required to anathematize ;² and connected the doctrine of 'the transubstantiation of the bread into the Body' with his ultimate condemnation.³

It has been mentioned that the Church in the West entered the period of inquiry and controversy which began in the sixteenth century with certain disadvantages with regard to the doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice, one of the greatest of which was the failure to remember the connexion of the offering of the Church on earth with that of our Lord in heaven. As to the doctrine of the Presence of Christ in the consecrated Sacrament, the Church in the West was similarly hampered by the extent to which it had become committed to the philosophical theory of the change of the substance of the bread and the wine so that, after the consecration, of the bread and the wine only the accidents remained.

(To be continued.)

ART. XI.—THE CHURCH AND EDUCATION.

1. *Resolutions passed by the Joint Committee of the Convocations of Canterbury and York sitting in Committee, July 1901.*
2. *The Coming Education Bill.* By J. H. VOXALL, M.P.
Published by the National Union of Teachers. (London, 1901.)

IN our last number we devoted considerable space to the discussion of the whole question of education in this country, and we feel that we need hardly demand the pardon of our readers for again recurring to a subject which, however little it may lend itself to entertaining treatment, is of supreme importance. We stated then that, in our opinion, the most really pressing need for the country—fundamentally, probably more pressing than any other—was an efficient system of education, and we are glad to quote in support of our contention a statement by a political leader whose peculiar position of detachment has made his insight into the trend of public opinion as remarkable as his incapacity to carry out his ideas

¹ Hardouin, *Concilia*, 381.

² *Ibid.* 457.

³ *Ibid.* 565.

practically. In his speech at Chesterfield on December 17 last, Lord Rosebery stated, quite correctly, we believe, that what the majority of the nation, certainly what the great body of the middle and working classes, demand is efficiency, and that especially in education :

' But last, and perhaps greatest of all these issues and questions that underlie the efficiency of our nation—not of our services, not of any particular branch of our nation, but of the nation as a whole—I mean education—(loud cheers)—in which we are lagging sadly, and with which we shall have peacefully to fight other nations with weapons like the bow and arrow if we do not progress. We have nothing like a national system, but a great chaos of almost haphazard arrangements.'

The loud cheers which greeted this reference to education, and especially the efficiency of education, expressed, we believe, correctly the sentiments of the country, and the Government which does not realize this is doomed to receive a very serious blow. We are not, we regret to say, at all hopeful that anything wise or statesmanlike will be produced by the present Government ; but it is the duty of the Church to recognize the situation, to take the opportunity now offered to formulate a wise and comprehensive policy, and to press this policy on the nation in a dignified and weighty manner.

Is it doing this ? There are some among its members who have grasped what is needed, but there are many who have not, and the whole management of the question has shown the most singular incapacity and inefficiency. We will give an illustration. As is now well known, certain proposals were agreed upon at a joint Committee of the two Houses of Convocation last July. The last of these stated 'that in view of the grave issues involved in the conclusions arrived at in the foregoing resolutions, a united effort be made by Churchmen to urge upon his Majesty's Government the necessity of introducing and pressing during the coming session legislation on the lines therein indicated.' How was this resolution acted on ? What was done ? The answer is, Nothing. No one knew that the two Convocations had met ; no report was sent to the press ; no one realized that any resolutions had been passed. Here was a Church policy formulated. It was adopted by the only completely representative Church body that exists (however inadequate that may be) ; it was adopted, some reports say, unanimously, others, by large majorities, but as the public are not considered worthy of being informed concerning the deliberations of this body, we

cannot speak exactly ; it is, we believe, on the whole a very wise scheme. Yet the matter was allowed to remain quite dead. During the autumn the Church Conference was to meet ; the Diocesan Conferences in most dioceses were to be called together. Many of them had to meet without having heard of it. At last accidentally, in an unauthorised way, these resolutions appeared in a corner of the *Guardian* newspaper. We have seldom seen a more miserable example of political incompetence. Even to this day we believe that many churchmen have never heard of these resolutions, that many of them have never had their meaning brought home to them, and that many of those interested are not aware that what are called the resolutions of a Committee are really resolutions of the whole of the Northern and Southern Conventions, and that the word 'Committee' is only a technical term.

We might multiply instances. The Bishops met, we were informed by the press, at the beginning of November in solemn conclave to consider this question ; but they did nothing, or if they did anything they allowed it to remain in the obscurity which they seem to consider befits their opinions.¹ At a joint meeting of the Boards of Education of London, Rochester, and St. Albans, the Convocation resolutions were generally approved of. The meeting was singularly unanimous, and the expressions of opinion were strong. These bodies are very important representatives of public opinion ; we might expect that some attempt would be made to make their opinions known. We believe that some report did appear in small print in one or two papers. We ourselves succeeded in discovering it in the *Guardian*, and we believe that it was also found in the *Times*. We may be mistaken, but we venture to think that a meeting presided over by the Bishop of London, the Bishop of Rochester, and the Bishop of St. Albans, and representing the Church educational opinion—lay and clerical—of somewhere about 6,000,000 people and of many hundreds of churches, ought with a little trouble to make its voice heard somewhat more distinctly. We do not wish the Church to be political, but there are certain political questions on which it ought to confess its opinion in a clear and weighty manner.

We are not much concerned to apportion the blame. We believe that the Church is suffering in this matter from not possessing a leader—that the initiative is coming from

¹ The Bishop of Gloucester (*Guardian*, December 18, 1901) says they are unanimous.

below
and
that
amo
its
whic
the
spor
long
The
are
mira
The
they
absol
area
dem
few
forg
Chu
part
take
absol
wan
sugg
our
deno
their
are
outs
T
to th
been
Som
held
ches
Exe
some
sche
gene
the C
for d
simil
less
equa

below and finds it hard to make its voice felt. We believe, and we wish to express our opinion strongly and decisively, that the Church is suffering from the absence of leisure among the Bishops, who are its natural leaders, to attend to its concerns. So long as they are hampered by dioceses which have the population of kingdoms, and attempt, with the assistance of one or two chaplains, to manage the corresponding mass of routine business and of diocesan details, so long they will be unable to do much of their proper duty. The Bishops, we believe, glory in their large dioceses; they are exhilarated by the sense of work, and by the almost miraculous amount of energy they are enabled to exhibit. They feel that they are grappling with their dioceses, and they are often doing so magnificently. But while they are absorbed in the management of their overgrown and populous areas, and accomplishing, often at an age when they might demand the retirement of literary ease, a mass of work which few professions in the kingdom can rival, they seem to forget their position as leaders of the whole Church. The Church wants leaders. The great body of the Church—particularly of the laity—looks naturally to the Bishops to take upon themselves this function. How can they do so if absorbed in the details of diocesan management? We are wandering somewhat from our point, but our text has suggested a telling illustration of a great need. As long as our Bishops—and particularly our leading Bishops—are burdened with excessive dioceses, they will fail in a great part of their duty, while the very exhilaration of the work which they are accomplishing will make them blind to defects which outsiders can see.

The action of the Church was naturally hampered, owing to the failure of its leaders to indicate the policy which had been adopted. But a good deal has been accomplished. Some twenty-one Diocesan Conferences appear to have been held in the autumn. Of these St. David's, Wakefield, Manchester, St. Albans, Peterborough, Rochester, Lichfield, Exeter, and Chester adopted the Convocation resolutions—some definitely, some generally. At Oxford a similar scheme was outlined by Sir William Anson, and secured the general assent of the clergy present. Lincoln recommended the Convocation scheme to its Diocesan Board of Education for discussion. Ripon passed a long resolution of its own on similar lines. Bath and Wells, Bristol, York, and Truro were less definite, but all desired something. Llandaff demanded equal treatment. At Carlisle, Gloucester, Winchester, and

Liverpool education appears not to have been discussed. Various other representative bodies have supported the resolution, such as a meeting held at Truro, at which Mr. Athelstan Riley made an able speech, and, as we have said, a large joint meeting of the Board of Education of London, Rochester, and St. Albans.¹

It would have been well if the proposals had been discussed more amply, but we are justified, we believe, in regarding them as fixing the basis of a united Church policy. Before, however, we discuss them in detail, let us ask what should be the principles of a Church policy? It should, in the first place, aim at making the education of the country as efficient as possible. And it should press upon the Government the importance of this. It should absolutely refuse to allow itself to be a party to any inefficient, cramped system, to anything that is intended to retard education or to restrict its influence. In the next place, it should aim at securing for all children for whom it is legitimately responsible a sound religious education—not merely instruction in religious subjects or in Biblical knowledge by unsympathetic teachers, but an education based as far as possible on religion. It could claim that by so doing it would confer the greatest possible benefit upon the nation, that a sound moral and religious training are as essential for the well-being of the nation as intellectual progress or technical skill. In the third place, it should demand equality of treatment for its own schools and for the schools of every other religious body. It should ask for justice, and concede justice, believing that a sound Non-conformist or Roman Catholic education is infinitely better than one purely secular, and that real religious equality in the eyes of the law can be the only wise basis for national education. With these principles in view, we propose now to discuss the main headings of the proposed legislation.

I. The first point in the scheme as proposed is the creation of a single educational authority to deal with all education, primary and secondary, within certain local areas. It is not always definitely stated, but it is always implied, that the area should be the administrative county, *i.e.* that

¹ One of the disadvantages of this inadequate discussion in the proper place is that those who are inclined not to acquiesce proceed to write to the Church papers. A very few persons are in that way able to create the appearance of being an important body. We have attempted to estimate the value of this correspondence. Many of the letters simply show that the writers have not understood the proposal. This is not their fault, but the fault of their leaders. The remaining objections do not seem to represent any large number of individuals.

every c
authori
althoug
is a po
large b
manag
deman
large
sary to
differ
is a la
body
opinio
Counc
half, o
of rep
or of
to go
shoul
shoul
Secom
know
those
arena
for a
single
of the

T
an o
over-
must
mana
opini
of at
tions
our
them
part
Cour
of th
for
inclu
belie
the
fairl

every county and county borough should have its educational authority. This is not a point peculiar to the Church scheme, although it is, we believe, essential to the working of it. It is a point on which we should find ourselves in harmony with a large body of public opinion. The creation of one body for managing all education, primary and secondary alike, is demanded by all interested in secondary education and by a large number of educational reformers. It is, in fact, necessary to prevent overlapping and undue competition between different schools and authorities. A question on which there is a larger amount of difference of opinion is as to how this body is to be created. There is, however, a preponderant opinion in favour of making it a Committee of the County Council. As to its members, it would probably consist, as to one-half, of members of the County Council, and the remainder of representatives of various bodies interested in education, or of persons co-opted for the same reason. We do not wish to go into further details. The essential point is that it should not be a body directly elected *ad hoc*. That this should be so was the recommendation of the Commission on Secondary Education. It appeals to common sense and knowledge of human nature. It is directly opposed to all those who wish education to continue in the future to be the arena of partisan and sectarian passions. We believe that for a wise and sane educational system the two points of a single authority, and a single authority acting as a Committee of the County Council and not elected *ad hoc*, to be essential.

The advantages may be summed up as follows. We want an orderly system, but we want above all things to avoid over-centralization and excessive uniformity. Education must be adapted to the different localities; it must be managed by bodies of sufficient size to be open to public opinion, to be free from smaller local jealousies, and capable of attracting able and competent men. All these qualifications the County Council satisfies. In the reorganization of our local self-government the County Councils have shown themselves singularly capable. They attract for the most part good men, and have done their work well. Parish Councils are futile. District Councils are largely in the hands of the least progressive local farmers. County Councils have for the most part managed the work entrusted to them, including education, exceedingly well. They are ready, we believe, to undertake the work; and, as was stated at one of the Diocesan conferences, they will treat religious questions fairly and honestly.

There is only one objection which we have heard. It is suggested that the County Councils will be so anxious to create an educational 'ladder' from the primary school upwards that they will sacrifice higher educational advantages to the lower. We do not really fear that. The standard of higher education must be set on the one side by the universities, on the other by the commercial needs of the district. No doubt facilities will be given for the clever boys of the elementary schools, by scholarships and in other ways, to rise, as they have always been able to do in the past history of the country; but the standards will be fixed by the needs of the learned professions on the one side, and by the scientific need of men of mechanical skill and linguistic culture on the other. We certainly do not believe that by making education more democratic we shall make it less efficient than it has been.

There are details of organization which we do not feel that it is our place to work out, for example the position to be assigned to the smaller municipalities within the county area. For London, the right principle has probably been laid down in the following motion passed at the meeting of the London, Rochester, and St. Albans joint boards:

'That London should be dealt with on the same fundamental principle as the rest of the country—viz. (a) That of making education an integral part of municipal self-government in county and borough; and (b) that of bringing both classes of schools into close relations with local authority.'

The exact method in which this should be carried out is again not a matter on which we need express an opinion.

II. The second point is that the Church demands equal treatment, as a simple matter of justice, for all elementary schools. The following are the two resolutions:

1. That all schools be financed, as far as the cost of maintenance exclusive of repairs of the structure in voluntary schools is concerned, out of public funds, whether Imperial or local: and that it be no condition of participation in these funds by voluntary schools whether any form of religious instruction be, or be not, taught in those schools.

2. That the funds needed for capital expenditure on the School buildings, as well as for necessary extensions and structural alterations, be provided by the body to which the school belongs, but that the managers be not liable for any other expenditure.

This implies a definite claim for justice. A large portion of the nation desires a different type of religious education from that provided in Board schools. It demands that, as far as is reasonably possible, schools should be provided which

give st
that pa
to such
unden
ground
tion wi
should

It
up the
necess
bury n
stated
clergy
believ
tions.
selves
consid
been r
been r
which
of the
volunt
viously
arises
difficu
at the
have in
Aid G
an inc
state f
and th
Does r
of effo
or lat
system
educat
that th
for the
justice

But
comple

¹ Th
among
child in
speaks

give such an education, and it claims that it is just as fair that part of the rates paid by Nonconformists should be given to such schools as that part of what others pay should go to undenominational schools. This claim is made simply on the ground of justice. If one part of the nation have the education which they desire paid for entirely out of public funds, so should the other part.

It has been asked, Is it wise for the Church to give up the voluntary system? The answer simply is that it is necessary. At a recent meeting the Archbishop of Canterbury made an appeal in favour of the voluntary system, and stated that the reason it was failing was that the younger clergy were indifferent to education. The accusation is, we believe, most unjust. There has been no falling-off in subscriptions. What proportion of these come from the clergy themselves we do not know, but the amount that they give is often considerable, and although clerical incomes have since 1870 been reduced nearly 50 per cent., their subscriptions have not been reduced. The real difficulty lies in the inevitable change which is the result of making education directly the business of the State. A generation brought up when there were only voluntary schools will continue to do what they have previously done, under changed conditions; a new generation arises which notices the change and adapts itself to it. The difficulty, further, is the increased expense. Let us look simply at the facts. Since the Aid Grant was given subscriptions have increased. The voluntary schools, therefore, have all the Aid Grant and the increased subscriptions, and in many cases an increased Government grant. Yet they are in as bad a state financially as they were before the Aid Grant was given,¹ and that entirely through the increased cost of education. Does not this speak for itself? It is not slackness or failure of effort; it is the inevitable result which must come sooner or later when a voluntary system competes with a State system. It is largely just because many of the clergy care for educational efficiency that they feel that it is no longer right that their schools should be hampered by inadequate means for the sake of bolstering up a system which has neither justice nor expediency to commend it.

But, it will be remarked, the resolutions do not ask for complete equality. The Church still undertakes to provide

¹ The amount of the Aid Grant was 5s. a head, unequally distributed among different schools. Since 1897 the average cost per head of each child in elementary schools has increased more than 5s. a head. This speaks for itself.

the buildings and all necessary permanent additions and alterations. As there has been some doubt in interpretation, it may be stated that the intention of the resolutions is that everything which is now charged in Form IX. should be paid by the Local Authority, *i.e.* the necessary annual repairs and renewals of premises, but that all capital expenditure must be borne by the body to which the school belongs. It may be objected that this is not absolutely fair. Looked at in an abstract way, that may be so. Practically it is, we believe, reasonable, and at any rate it is not disadvantageous to the Church. The school is an adjunct to the church. It is often used for many other purposes besides day-schools—for Sunday-schools, classes, meetings, &c. It is part of the church property, and may naturally and reasonably, therefore, be provided by the Church. Moreover if alterations were provided out of the rates the school buildings could not revert to the Church, at any rate to that extent. We do not think an alternative proposal is so wise, that the Church should pay for the religious teaching. We may put it quite strongly in this way, that if public funds were used to provide undenominational religious teaching, which the churchman objects to, it is equally reasonable that they should be used to provide other sorts of religious teaching, although some one else objects to it. A vast majority of the nation that thinks about these things is agreed that education ought to be religious. If we all thought alike there would be no difficulty in providing it quite fairly. As we do not, the fairest way is, as far as is practically possible, to devise a scheme which shall put all types of school in an equal position. Moreover as a matter of fact if the Church were to undertake to pay for religious teaching it would have to pay more than it does at present.

III. The next point is, What share in the management of its schools must the Church give? The claim that there shall be no aid from the rates given unless a voice in the management be given to the ratepayers is one which may be considered fundamental. This claim is provided for by the following resolution:

'3. That the government of every school, and especially the appointment and dismissal of the teachers, be left in the hands of the present Committee of Management, with the addition of certain members appointed by, or under rules made by, the Local Authority, such additional members not to exceed one-third of the whole number.'

There are two sides from which this resolution may be viewed. Does it concede so much as the State or the rate-

payer
teach
consi
Auth
the s
there
cont
any r
whom
school
sion t
name
appoi
it is
would
Churc
it sho
bilty
unfair
Br
the o
certai
Welsh
Nonco
simply
no do
arise,
greate
Nonco
able, h
Some
will a
Churc
Counc
power
reason
educat
To
dividu
tion.
The su
that t
associa
Aid G
unreal
VOL

payers may demand? And does it safeguard the religious teaching of the schools? As to the first point, if any one considers the question a moment he will see that the Local Authority will be in a very strong position. It will finance the schools; if the strict legal requirements are not fulfilled, if there is any legitimate defect, it will be able to refuse to continue their support. It will audit the accounts, or at any rate see that they are properly audited. The managers whom it appoints will be quite competent to see that the schools are properly managed. There is one further concession that will be demanded, and ought certainly to be granted, namely, that the Local Authority should have a veto on the appointment and dismissal of teachers. This, provided that it is required to state its reason for objecting, in writing, would be reasonable and proper. Not only should the Church avoid all appearance of claiming excessive power, it should also realize that to possess it is bad. The possibility of appeal will remove the danger of acting unjustly and unfairly, to which the best men are liable if uncontrolled.

But this proposal has also been severely criticized from the other side. It has been maintained that it would in certain cases produce an impossible condition of affairs. In a Welsh village a hostile County Council would appoint a local Nonconformist minister on the board of managers, who would simply devote himself to creating a disturbance. We have no doubt that there will be villages in which difficulties will arise, but that must be the case whatever happens. It is the greatest mistake to legislate for extreme cases. The local Nonconformist minister may try and make himself disagreeable, but if he does so he will at once lose all his influence. Some parsons are cantankerous. Difficulties and disturbances will always arise if people are tactless. The rights of the Church are quite sufficiently guaranteed; and if the County Council or the local agitator act in a purely partisan way their power will soon decline, while if the clergyman does not act reasonably it will be his own fault if he ceases to control the education of the school.

To imagine cases where the unreasonableness of individuals will cause friction is never a strong form of objection. No one should ever legislate for single instances. The suggestion that has been put forward in some quarters, that the Local Authority should be represented in the associations which have been formed for the distribution of Aid Grants, may be dismissed. This would be an absolutely unreal concession. Such bodies are far too large to exercise

any direct influence. The offer on our part would be delusive, and would appear so at once. The intervention of these bodies would cause needless complication. But we think that in the interests of efficiency it would be desirable that facilities should be granted or arranged for grouping schools in contiguous areas. Such an arrangement will certainly be made in the case of Board schools, which will have to be managed by local managers and will be formed into convenient groups. It would be very beneficial for the efficiency of voluntary schools that those in adjacent parishes should be allowed or encouraged, or even compelled, to group themselves. In many small parishes the efficiency of the schools, whether Board or voluntary, depends upon the clergy, and not all clergy are efficient school managers. Such groups, whether in town or country, would not be unwieldy, would minimize the danger of personal friction, would promote efficiency, and would do away with the isolation which hampers so many of our smaller parishes.

IV. The fourth point is expressed as follows :

'4. That whenever a reasonable number of parents desire that religious instruction in accordance with their own belief should be given to their children, opportunity for such instruction should be secured to them by statute in all elementary schools, provided that this can be done without expense to the managers.'

This is really the protection of minorities. If the system which we have sketched be carried out, it will probably be found that gradually in many towns and districts the supply of Church and denominational schools will, at any rate approximately, adapt itself to the demand. And provision to bring this about ought to be inserted in the bill. The same rule should hold as at present prevails in Scotland, that in deciding whether a school is necessary, regard should be had to the religious beliefs of the parents. It will become possible for the Local Authority to see that particular bodies have schools in certain localities adapted to their needs, like the Jewish schools under the London School Board. But in many country districts the minorities are so small as to make the provision of different schools impossible. It is to protect these minorities, whether in town or country, that the conscience clause is required. But that clause is a relic of the days when it was considered sufficient to prevent religious teaching. This is a sort of negative justice, which implies that we do not mind if our children are brought up without any knowledge of religion, provided that they do not

learn
justi
publi
dema
for t
state
supre
ably
V
incl
clerg
a mo
trict
than
walls
their
Scot
the o
ing tw
that t
ligiou
of the
they
must
There
religio
of oth
W
sketch
wise.
will b
sugge
in sub
many
questi
Gover
doubt.
dole.
want a
have b
volunt
imagin
things
religio

learn what we think wrong. This is a most one-sided sort of justice. If the schools in our villages are supported out of public funds, the Nonconformist minority may reasonably demand that as far as possible facilities should be granted for their ministers to teach their children in a class-room at stated hours. In towns where the School Board system is supreme, the clergy of the Church of England may reasonably make the same demand.

We regret to find that a small section of the clergy are inclined to reject this proposal. It is stated that the devoted clergy of St. Peter's, London Docks, who possess, we believe, a monopoly of the education of their curiously isolated district, have intimated that they will close their schools rather than admit any erroneous teaching to be given within their walls. Surely this is not either wise or right. What would be their own position if they were a small minority among Scotch Presbyterians? Their children would have to go to the only school. If they were granted the right of teaching twice a week, would they refuse it? Would they consider that the Presbyterians were making a compromise with religious truth by allowing it? They would probably complain of the infringement of the principles of religious liberty if they were not allowed. We must be perfectly just. We must allow others exactly what we should claim ourselves. There are times when our own conscientious adherence to our religious principles, if it is injurious to the religious belief of others, comes perilously near to self-will.

We have in this and the last number of the *Review*¹ sketched a scheme, a scheme which we believe to be just and wise. Is there any reason for hoping or expecting that it will be carried out? We may say at once that what has been suggested is not put forward without good authority. That in substantial outline, at any rate, it has commended itself to many of those best qualified to take a broad view of the question, without political or sectarian prejudice. But that the Government will rise to a great and wise measure we very much doubt. There have been rumours that we are to have another dole. It is time surely for the Church to say that it does not want any more doles, that it wants wisdom and justice. There have been rumours that the question of giving rate aid to voluntary schools is to be left to local option. We cannot imagine a more unstatesmanlike proposal. There are many things that local option can well decide, but the position of religious education is a national question, and should be

¹ See *Church Quarterly Review*, October 1901, p. 160.

settled by the nation. Educational progress demands that the religious question should be settled, and not that it should be stirred up. To introduce local option would make every town and county in England a scene of bitter religious strife. Moreover such a system would be absolutely unworkable. The income would be precarious, and the imposition of a county rate would be impossible if the whole county did not share in the benefit of it. It has been rumoured that certain persons have said that if voluntary schools are supported out of the rates they will refuse to pay them, as they refused to pay Church rates. Such threats deserve attention only when they have justice behind them, and the person who would have justice on his side in refusing to pay rates is the churchman, who has to support both his own schools and those which give what he considers most inadequate religious instruction.

What will be done we do not know. We are firmly convinced that if the Government introduce a wise, comprehensive, and complete measure they will pass it, provided they have any determination, and that they will raise very high their position in the country. If they introduce a one-sided and incomplete bill, the fiasco, to which we have become accustomed, will be repeated. And we doubt whether any Government will be able to survive many such failures. As for the Church, we are convinced that a comprehensive Bill will be passed—if not by a Government which is reputed to be favourable, by some other Government. We do not believe that the great body of the electors have the slightest desire to treat Church schools unfairly,¹ that they are enamoured of School Boards or of political Nonconformity. They will not resent a wise and fair scheme. What they will resent is any attempt to injure education, or any one-sided and narrow policy. We may be quite certain that attempts will be made to confuse the issue, and that those friends of education who have never spent a farthing of their own money on schools will denounce as the enemies of education a Church which has spent over 40,000,000*l.* The only thing that remains for us to do is to formulate a wise policy—that, we believe, has been done—and to spare no effort in pressing home our demands. The Church, if united and determined, is a strong body—stronger than either its friends or its

¹ Very important from this point of view is the pamphlet by Mr. Yoxall, which represents the opinions of a Liberal member of Parliament who is a leading official of the National Union of Teachers. It is completely without any opposition to voluntary schools, and outlines a scheme into which the present proposals would fit easily and naturally.

enem
or na
of a
illeg
coun
polic

The

THE
detrac
it the
open-
of oth
be sp
be, si
some
kind
busin
not m
purpo
unusu
ings,
so sec
the n
with
does
and it
intrin
docum
excurs
gain s
he oug
In
right
interp
Hort's
he rej
foreign
very si
might
and it
sition

enemies believe. If its policy at the present crisis be unwise or narrow, if it allows its demands to injure the construction of a wise educational scheme, if it attempts to gain any illegitimate advantage, it will alienate large sections of the country; but it will not alienate them by a sober and sincere policy.

SHORT NOTICES.

I.—NEW TESTAMENT.

The Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude. By the Rev. CHARLES BIGG, D.D. 'The International Critical Commentary.' (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1901.)

THE lack of access to libraries, which Dr. Bigg fears may have detracted from the completeness of his book, has perhaps added to it the more excellent qualities of lucidity, directness, and a kind of open-air good sense. Useful as frequent references to the opinions of other writers are, they interrupt the attention of the reader and may be spared without too much regret if they are, as they sometimes may be, signs of an exaggerated literary habit which is in these days to some extent obscuring truth. There are as many references of the kind as need be in this book, and it fulfils admirably the great business of a commentary, that, namely, of helping the reader to grasp not merely the meaning of particular words and phrases, but the purpose of the whole epistles. This end is reached, however, in an unusual way. There are none of those analyses, paraphrases, headings, and other aids of arrangement by which the student has been so securely guided through several of the letters of St. Paul. Here the notes run straight on without a break, each difficulty is dealt with rather briefly as it comes, textual criticism (in which Dr. Bigg does not appear to be much interested) is mingled with exegesis, and its problems are solved as a rule with more reference to the intrinsic probability of separate readings than on broad principles of documentary relationships, and there are no detached notes or excursuses. And yet any one who studies the introductions will gain such an insight into the mind of the writers of these epistles that he ought to be able to follow their argument without much difficulty.

In the notes a few faults might be found. Dr. Bigg has a downright way of crashing through a difficulty to reach a fair working interpretation which contrasts unfavourably with the patience of Hort's fragment. In 1 Peter i. 4, for instance, *τερηρημένον εἰς ὑμᾶς*, he rejects the rendering 'until you,' because 'this sense appears to be foreign to our passage, and "until you" for "until your days" is a very singular, if not impossible, use of the preposition.' But reasons might be given for considering 'until you' suitable to the passage, and it is worth discussion whether a very singular use of the preposition might not be a possible one here. He seems also to mistrust

too much the nicety of New Testament Greek, as in 1 Peter iv. 3, where the perfect participle *πεπορευμένοι* has surely been used on purpose, implying probably that a habit had been formed—they not only walked but had become habitual walkers in these evil ways. Here and there this leads to positive mistakes, as in 1 Peter iv. 6, *ἵνα κριθῶσι μὲν σαρκὶ ζῶσι δὲ πνεύματι*, where the tense of the subjunctive *κριθῶσι* can hardly have any reference to *time* at all; and in 2 Peter i. 17, *λαβὼν δόξαν φωνῆς ἐνεχθείσης*, where it would certainly be natural that *ἐνεχθείσης* should go before *λαβὼν* in point of time, and the addition of *καὶ* between the participles in the quotation from Thucydides really would appear to make the difference which Dr. Bigg denies. These, however, are comparatively trifling details, and hardly affect the usefulness of this most original commentary.

The heart of the book is in two sections of the introduction on 'Doctrine, Discipline, and Organization in 1 Peter,' and 'St. Peter and St. Paul in the New Testament.' The life and character of the two apostles are sketched with vigour and sympathy: St. Peter in particular is presented to us in a very beautiful picture—

'a labouring man, uneducated, rough in speech and manner, open-minded and docile, but bearing the stamp of his class who in England, and presumably elsewhere, are tender-hearted but slow. They have seen too much of the hard realities of life to be greatly elated or greatly depressed. But they make fine soldiers, who will follow their captain to the last, and fall where he has placed them . . . he is often spoken of as ardent and impulsive, but our Lord called him Cephas, "Rock" . . . the Gospels paint him as a man of slow understanding, but strong conviction, of tender, but not demonstrative feeling, with an exquisitely delicate conscience, and a deep sense of the majesty of God . . . we may imagine him as a shy, timid, embarrassed man, apt on a sudden emergency to say and do the wrong thing, not because he was hasty, but because he was not quick. He was one of those who become leaders because they have been called and appointed, not because nature seems to have marked them out for command . . . the Lord loved John better, but He trusted Peter more.'

St. Paul, on the other hand, was 'well-born, probably wealthy, well educated, full of fiery conviction and prompt resolution, a natural leader of men in times of great excitement'; more important still, he was a man whose whole life was changed by 'a blow struck from above with overwhelming force and instantaneous effect.' No doubt the way had been prepared, but the fact remains, 'in one moment he became a Christian.' But this is not all. The steady growth of Peter, the astounding conversion of Paul, were harmonious with the natures of the two. 'Every man is born an Aristotelian or a Platonist,' said Coleridge, and Dr. Bigg evidently believes him. It is the difference between the Disciplinarian and the Mystic, difficult terms of which no definition is given in this book, though we do find what is more useful, a good description of the two characters.

'A Disciplinarian is one who hears God speaking to him; a Mystic is one who feels the presence of God within. The former says, "Christ is my Saviour, Shepherd, Friend, my Judge, my Rewarder"; the latter says, "Not I live, but Christ liveth in me." The former sedulously dis-

ting
sink
idea
Fear
the
Inne
and
tend
of m
betw
the c
myst

Pete
we x
1 Pe
to e
find
thin
the
idea
that
wor
mus
sam
just
mus
Apo
min
decl
apos
wide
as o

emin
diffe
that
the
time
nism
St. I

and
true
over
trac
min
men
Test
men
a ki

tinguishes the human personality from the divine; the latter seeks to sink his own personality in the divine. Hence the leading Disciplinary ideas are Grace considered as a gift, Law, Learning, Continuity, Godly Fear—in all these human responsibility is kept steadily in view. But the leading Mystic ideas are Grace as an indwelling power, Freedom, the Inner Light, Discontinuity (Law and Gospel, Flesh and Spirit, World and God), and Love. Nothing is more difficult than to define these two tendencies in the abstract, because they run into one another in shapes of manifold diversity. Yet it is easy in practice to see the difference between, for instance, William Laud and George Fox. A great part of the difficulty of discrimination arises from the fact that many people use mystic language, though they are really and truly disciplinarians.

Here, then, is the difference between not only St. Paul and St. Peter, but also the Pauline and Petrine epistles. Here, we feel as we read his commentary, is the proof which satisfies Dr. Bigg that 1 Peter is what it professes to be, a letter of St. Peter's from beginning to end. He gives due consideration to the *Testimonia Veterum*, and finds in them on the whole a strong chain of evidence, but something else has made up his mind for him. He is fully conscious of the resemblance in words, phrases, and sometimes in connexion of ideas between 1 Peter and certain epistles of St. Paul, but he sees that there is no 'Paulinism' in 1 Peter; but that, on the contrary, words like *πίστις*, *χάρις*, *πνεῦμα* are used there as a Disciplinary must use them, in the Pauline epistles as a Mystic uses them. The same difference of mind is visible all through, and 1 Peter is to him just what St. Peter would have written, and just such a letter as must have been found side by side with the Pauline letters, if the Apostolic Church really represented the abiding variety of human mind and life. Thus the truth which Baur saw and distorted is declared again in a better form. 'The dogmatic teaching of the two apostles was identical,' but 'in the practical sphere St. Peter differs widely from St. Paul, not as one who misunderstands a teacher, but as one who looks at things from a different point of view.'

'There are, as is well known, grave practical differences between eminent and sincere Christians. Is it absurd to maintain that these differences have always existed, that they are to be found in the Gospels, that they correspond to the ancient and inevitable distinction between the Realist and Nominalist, that they caused as much heat in primitive times as in our own, that they brought even apostles into sharp antagonisms, that in effect St. Peter was the first great High Churchman, and St. Paul the first great Low Churchman?'

In this there is, perhaps, an exaggerated vivacity of expression, and it must, we think, be allowed that Dr. Bigg has not taken quite so true a view of St. Paul as he has of St. Peter. His argument, moreover, will have little weight with those who have been trained to trace the pedigrees of phrases rather than the development of living minds, but there are probably many who will feel that this commentary has disclosed to them a reality in the writings of the New Testament which they knew little of before. Among these will be men who have themselves been troubled by talk about conversions of a kind which they have never experienced, and which they somehow

know they never will experience ; parish priests too, especially in the country, who have been perplexed by what has seemed to them false confidence based on a simple, strong, yet curiously limited faith in many of their poorer parishioners ; some, again, who in their heart of hearts confess that much of what they read in St. Paul is alien to them, and who find more guidance, encouragement, and above all sympathy in this affectionate reverent epistle of St. Peter, which presents no new ideas but makes old truths certain to them. Such men will understand that it is Mysticism which has been opposed to their Disciplinarianism, and they will recognize with conviction the same opposition in the New Testament where it passes into the harmony to which all moods belong.

When, however, we turn from 1 Peter to 2 Peter a more difficult problem presents itself. Dr. Bigg thinks both were written, not indeed by St. Peter's own hand, but by his direction and under his supervision. In both he must be supposed to have employed a secretary or draughtsman who put his thoughts into Greek for him. This prevents our building much on comparison of words or phraseology ; but if a likeness in the thought which lies behind the words can be discovered that would really be an argument for a common authorship. Dr. Bigg thinks he can discover such a likeness, particularly in the habit of verbal repetition of a peculiar kind, and in the manner in which tradition is blended with the use of the Hebrew Scripture. It will be necessary for those who would understand the force of his argument to read not only the introductions but the notes on all three epistles, for in this as in other matters the notes fill up and reinforce the introductions. The *Testimonia Veterum*, with Dr. Bigg's comments, leave the impression that nothing certain can be proved from them. That there is nothing in the vocabulary, style, or subject-matter of 2 Peter which demands a later date than the apostolic age, and that 'traces of the second century are absent at those points where they might have been expected to occur,' does, in our judgment, seem to be fairly proved. But here again we feel as we read that what has convinced Dr. Bigg is his own certain (as it seems to him) recognition of the very same disciplinarian apostolic mind in 2 Peter as in 1 Peter.

'What history teaches us is that, both in secular and religious affairs, the broad catholic party, the party which has no name, always exists and is always powerful. It is Reason, flanked on both wings by Emotion, on the left by eagerness for the future, on the right by strong affection for the past. Both Emotions belong to Reason, and Reason knows how to use them in time and in measure. It shapes that view of Christianity which we find in the Synoptic Gospels, in the Book of Acts, and in the Epistles of Peter. It is a disciplinary and logical view ; it regards the Bible as a continuous revelation, and it limits the right of private judgment. The "Judaizers" never found a place in the Canon, though James sheltered them as far as he could. On the other wing, the author of Hebrews leans towards St. John, the Catholic Mystic, and, finally, in St. Paul we find the Protestant Mystic.

'Thus we gain an intelligible view of the early Church, and thus we see the value of 2 Peter. Value is not the same as authenticity. Yet, if

it has
defin
some
hostil

A
from
that
Epis
fact
to m
suspe
indee
expr
word
time

E
2 Pe
less
perh
wort
thou
with
forg
man
whic
Deo
that
by st
afres

Just

Not
It is
and
of th
yet i
cipli
perh
henc
they
and
done
men
who,
sacr
as h
too,
they

it has been shown that the Epistle fills a definite place, represents a definite party, and expresses the views that were really held by St. Peter, something not inconsiderable has been effected towards the removal of hostile preoccupations.'

As to the question, Did 2 Peter copy from St. Jude, or St. Jude from 2 Peter? Dr. Bigg gives many good reasons for supposing that the latter is the case. When, however, he says that 'the two Epistles must have been written at nearly the same time,' that 'in fact both Epistles may be samples of a circular that was addressed to many groups of Churches at the same time,' we cannot help suspecting that 'copying' is hardly the word to use. They cannot, indeed, be based on a common document, but they have had their expression determined by some common impulse—discussion, the words of a preacher, or some influence which was in the air at the time, though we cannot even make a guess at its nature.

However that may be, it is a pity Dr. Bigg should say that if 2 Peter be not really the work of St. Peter, it is 'neither more nor less than a forgery.' Eusebius appears to have thought that it was perhaps not by St. Peter, yet he was willing to believe it all but worthy of a place in the Canon; and we might well believe that, though we could not explain its origin, there was nothing connected with that origin which ought to be called by the harsh name of forgery. We have it in the Canon now secure, useful indeed to many still, and enlightened with some of the most splendid thoughts which are to be found in the New Testament, for all of which *laus Deo*. The immediate effect of this commentary will doubtless be that many will make a venture of faith and try what may be gained by studying the New Testament and the history of the apostolic age afresh on the working hypothesis that the epistle is St. Peter's.

Justification by Faith, and other Sacred Trusts in Harmony and Correlation. By H. W. HOLDEN, Vicar of North Grimston. (London: Skeffington and Son, 1901.)

NOTHING could illustrate Dr. Bigg's meaning better than this book. It is in many respects a good one, and sets forth with earnestness and force the great truth that loyal obedience and service is required of those who would enjoy salvation—that is, 'life and health.' And yet it seems just to miss the mark, because it is written by a Disciplinarian who cannot take the Mystic's point of view. There are, perhaps, people who say that by one act of faith all is gained, and henceforth there is no need of obedience and good works, but if they therefore live in sloth and disobedience they are hypocrites, and there is no need to confute them: Gospels and Epistles have done that once for all. But Mr. Holden is not thinking of these men only; he has in mind those mystical Churchmen and Dissenters who, though they may be wrong in some things, such as neglecting sacraments or the discipline of the Church, are not really so mistaken as he thinks about Justification. Their lives bear witness that they too, in practice, treat Justification as a state which continues, though they describe it, when they define the theological position, as some-

thing which has taken place once for all at some moment in the past. In this they are not wrong, for St. Paul, the Apostle who has taught us the doctrine of Justification, does the same. It was in accordance with his mystical nature to lay stress on the moment of change—the *Discontinuity*—and he always does. Mr. Holden is mistaken about Rom. v. 1; for though the Revised Version, having regard to the ordinary English use of the participle, has kept the translation 'being justified' for δικαιωθέντες, it is impossible to take this as a strict present; the aorist participle refers to a particular point of time, not to a continuous state. St. Paul does, indeed, here and everywhere, urge us to live as men who have been justified ought to live, but Salvation, not Justification, is what he tells us we must work out. It is quite true that in much popular teaching all this further work and glad service are passed over, and harm is done thereby, and Mr. Holden's treatise has, therefore, a legitimate purpose; but the popular teacher, if sincere, is in practice at one with him, only, being strongly mystical, he lays all stress on the new starting-point, and would have the rest follow naturally, as a matter of course. It is important to remember that in the case of the true Mystic it does follow: for the greatest marvel in his position is just this; with him the discontinuity is so thorough, the initial impulse so strong, that the power of temptation appears to be really broken, more than it ever is for the Disciplinarian, at least until he nears the end of his course. He, on the other hand, has aids and consolations which the Mystic lacks, and no true servant of Christ may be wholly Mystic or wholly Disciplinarian. St. Paul himself, if we trust the evidence of the Pastoral Epistles, became more disciplinarian as he grew older.

What Mr. Holden says at the beginning of his book about Justification being 'world-wide and time-long,' and of the 'larger hope' which is thus brought in, is beautiful, though from St. Paul alone it could hardly be proved; he has been listening to St. John, 'the Catholic Mystic.' It would have been well, however, to make clear—what no doubt he means—that all Justification, wherever and whenever it is or has been given, is 'only for the merit of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.'

The Second and Third Epistles of St. Paul to the Corinthians, with some Proofs of their Independence and Mutual Relation. By JAMES HOUGHTON KENNEDY, D.D. (London: Methuen and Co., 1900.)

DR. KENNEDY considers that the letter described in 2 Corinthians ii. is not to be found in 1 Corinthians, but has not been altogether lost. The end of it has, he believes, been preserved, and is now to be read in the last four chapters of our 2 Corinthians. This fragment was joined on to another fragmentary letter—our 2 Corinthians i.-ix., the latest written of the three—of which the end had been lost, and the piece thus compounded was published at some time after Clement had written his Epistle to Corinth. Professor Hausrath had already, in 1870, argued that the lost letter was identical with these chapters,

but
be f
Ken
does
tion
of M
view
cour
mea
plac
perh
of '
has
tran
inte
also

The

It i
a lo
star
whe
argu
use
Paul
atte
whi
whi
scra
The
way
poet
The
it c

The

Th
the
stri
som
Sm
he
bea
and
the
has

but against his theory lay the serious objection that no reference can be found in them to the as yet unsettled case of the offender. Dr. Kennedy has reached his own conclusion, to which this objection does not apply, independently, having been led to study the question by a remark once made in his hearing by Dr. Reichel, Bishop of Meath, and he defends it with great skill from many points of view. Many nice questions of interpretation are touched on in the course of exposition, the most important of which is that of the meaning of ἀναγνώσκειν in 2 Cor. i. 13 and iii. 2, in both of which places very good reasons are shown for believing that St. Paul, perhaps turning vulgar usage to account, gives the word its old sense of 'recognize' or 'acknowledge.' In 2 (3) Cor. i. 17 Dr. Kennedy has printed the false reading βουλευόμενος in his text, though he translates, and grounds an argument on, βουλόμενος. This is an interesting book, not merely in respect of its professed object, but also as giving the reader a glimpse into a scholar's workshop.

The Letters of St. Paul to Seven Churches and Three Friends.
Translated by ARTHUR S. WAY, M.A. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1901.)

It is always difficult to grasp the meaning of a letter which was written a long time ago to a person or persons whose mind and circumstances we only know in part, and the fact that we feel this difficulty when we read the letters of the New Testament, while it affords an argument for their being genuine, hinders us from making a proper use of them. Mr. Way was, therefore, well advised in rendering St. Paul's Epistles into the language of our modern life, and in attempting by his method of translation to add the connecting links which the reader needs. He has written an interesting preface in which he defends the printing of a very large number of passages as scraps from hymns. It is doubtful whether the defence is good. The idea is interesting, and each passage which he prints in this way is worth careful examination, but the habit of continually quoting poetry is a rather vulgar one from which St. Paul was probably free. The book, however, is excellent, and the sketch life of St. Paul which it contains will be useful.

The Bible and its Theology. By G. VANCE SMITH, B.A. Fifth edition, revised, and partly rewritten. (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1901.)

THE reappearance of a book which owed its importance mainly to the fact that it was directed against Dr. Liddon's *Bampton Lectures* strikes us as unfortunate. The reader finds it difficult to traverse a somewhat ancient field of controversy, and although Dr. Vance Smith has made some slight attempt to bring his book up to date, he fails, as we think, to be effective because he is to some extent beating the air. The conditions of the battle between Unitarianism and the Faith of the Church are altered. During the last forty years the advance of criticism has put a new aspect on old problems; it has shown combatants on both sides of the controversy that they

have something in common. It is surely less than fair to credit recent theologians with views which great divines of the last generation felt themselves bound to defend, but which have yielded to the spirit of scientific inquiry. We do not, accordingly, feel called upon to examine Dr. Vance Smith's position *de novo*. He certainly does not do justice to the writers in *Lux Mundi* if he supposes that they wish in any sense to discountenance 'more rational and truthful views of the origin, character, and interpretation of those Scriptures in which the common forms of theological belief claim to find their justification.' Indeed, with much that he says about the character of the Old Testament, the nature and conditions of prophecy, the development of Jewish faith, &c., many, if not most, instructed Churchmen nowadays would find themselves largely in agreement. On the other hand, the discussion of some important points of New Testament theology (e.g. the history of the Logos doctrine and the significance of Christ's atoning death) seems to us disappointingly slight and superficial. There is indeed some force in the writer's incidental criticism of Dr. R. W. Dale's 'argument from experience or consciousness,' but what we are chiefly interested to learn is whether Dr. Vance Smith has any positive contribution to make to religious problems, apart from the not very formidable criticism by which he seeks to discredit historical Christianity. The nearest approach to a constructive policy is to be found in his plea for 'the combination and organization of religious men of every name, for united Christian work in one grand national brotherhood, on the basis of Christ's teaching.' But he admits that this ideal can only be attained by the abolition of every 'creed of human devising.' It is strange that a writer who pleads so earnestly for the liberty of criticism should not perceive that in asking us to accept 'the spirit and word of Christ' as the basis of Church unity he is simply begging the very questions which criticism raises. The sincerity of Dr. Vance Smith is unquestionable, but neither in learning nor argumentative ability is he a powerful representative of modern Unitarianism.

Two Lectures on the Gospels. By F. CRAWFORD BURKITT, M.A. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1901.)

THE first of these lectures, which were delivered at the Cambridge Extension Summer Meeting in 1900, deals with the text of the Gospels. The second is concerned with their composition and origin. In the first lecture Mr. Burkitt's main points are two. He claims that 'the work of the textual critics of our generation has revealed the existence of' an 'interpolated edition of the Gospels as a literary work, which by its very existence shows that the four Gospels were already collected together about A.D. 150. The Gospels as separate works are yet older, but this interpolated edition is, I think, the earliest witness to their existence as the four volumes of a Canon.' And, secondly, he concludes his lecture with a discussion of 'the most important variation of all, viz. the omission or retention of the last twelve verses of St. Mark's Gospel.' From the evidence on this passage Mr. Burkitt argues, firstly, that 'the mutilation must

have
ulti
last
impe
'lyin
Chri
T
the
more
the
inter
textu
sugg
cont
mos
and
rega
Burl
pola
of e
that
curr
hom
neve
this
thes
gosp
Per
add
doc
ther
put
esse
dep
and
mai
Fro
and
the
how
mu
hav
the
Mr.
'be
crit
new

the
doc

have been originally accidental; all our copies, therefore, are ultimately descended from a single imperfect copy which had lost its last leaf; and, secondly, that 'a gospel which survives in a single imperfect copy, must have been, at least for a time, out of fashion,' 'lying neglected and forgotten in the tiny library of some early Christian, perhaps at Rome, perhaps at Alexandria.'

These different conclusions illustrate Mr. Burkitt's conception of the value of the modern science of textual criticism as something more than 'a machine to enable the student to construct a text of the New Testament which shall be complete, correct, and free from interpolations.' We know from Mr. Burkitt's other writings on textual criticism, such as his contributions to *Texts and Studies*, how suggestive as working hypotheses his theories may be, and those contained in the lecture before us are certainly important. The most important is that which affects the Canon of the Four Gospels, and the evidence, as he marshals it, seems to us stronger than in regard to the conclusion of St. Mark. The *data* on which Mr. Burkitt builds up his theory are the so-called 'Western Non-Interpolations,' e.g. St. Luke, xxii. 43, 44, xxiii. 34a, etc. By the method of exclusion Mr. Burkitt localizes their origin in the West, showing that, while they were not part of the Four Gospels as originally current in the East, and are absent from Origen's text, they are at home in the West, even in Africa, where so many later corruptions never penetrated. But further than this, Mr. Burkitt argues—and this is the really important new contribution—that the insertion of these details by all the authorities at the same point in different gospels (and that not always the right place, as in the case of the *Pericope Adulteræ*) proves that 'the ultimate source of all these additions to the narrative is not floating tradition or a non-canonical document, but a single interpolated edition of the Four Gospels themselves.' This 'glossed edition of the Four Gospels' we may put at latest about the middle of the second century. The absolutely essential point on which the truth of Mr. Burkitt's theory must depend is the distribution of the *phenomena* over the Four Gospels, and that in exactly the same authorities. Otherwise, all that can be maintained is a glossed edition of some one or more separate gospels. From St. John the only passages quoted are the *Pericope Adulteræ* and the passage about the Angel at the Pool; from St. Matthew the addition in xx. 28, and one or two other passages where, however, the manuscript authority for the additions varies very much. Besides the distribution of the *data* over the Gospels we have also to bear in mind the present uncertainty as to the history of the so-called Western text, of which these readings are characteristic. Mr. Burkitt reminds us early in his first lecture that, though we are 'beginning to be clear in what direction the next move' in textual criticism is to be 'we are still in the transition period between the new and the old.'

In the second lecture Mr. Burkitt begins by a brief discussion of the Synoptic problem, in which he takes up the position that the document which the first and third evangelists have independently

used is St. Mark's Gospel itself, and not an Ur-Marcus. The main difficulty in this view is, of course, the omission by St. Matthew and St. Luke of many of St. Mark's peculiarities; and in regard to this Mr. Burkitt adopts generally the view of Sir John Hawkins in his invaluable *Horæ Synopticæ*,¹ that many of those peculiarities may well have been passed over by the later evangelists as 'needless or even offensive.'

A large section of the lecture is devoted to the Fourth Gospel. Mr. Burkitt begins by quoting approvingly the language of Matthew Arnold in *God and the Bible* in regard to this Gospel, and some pages later (p. 67) adopts his conclusion, viz. 'that the work was issued in St. John's name, and very likely with his approval, by one who had gathered his materials from the lips of the Apostle.' Mr. Burkitt's own position is clear from such language as this (p. 66):—'Such a proceeding helps us to understand how the brief and pregnant words of Christ came to be amplified into the theological lectures which we read in the Fourth Gospel.' And again: 'That we have in it [*i.e.* the Fourth Gospel] throughout the accurate report of an eyewitness is surely inconceivable; at the same time there are too many indications that the writer of it had access to genuine traditions, *i.e.* to the memory of an Apostle, for us to reject it altogether as an historical source.' After referring to the statement in a Catena connecting the writing of the Gospel with Papias, Mr. Burkitt finds an improvement on that tradition in a prologue to a manuscript of the Vulgate—*Codex Toletanus*—quoted in Wordsworth and White's edition. We cannot, however, but think that Mr. Burkitt has to make an unjustifiable emendation in order to 'carry back the story' of the authorship another stage. The traditions of the *Catena* and the *Codex Toletanus* certainly both, as they stand, ascribe the authorship to Papias. The assertions made by Mr. Burkitt, quoted above, are the really important point, and we may hope that he will speak, as he regrets he cannot do in the lecture before us, 'more definitely about the composition and authorship' of the Gospel. All that he says in regard to the traditions mentioned, and also earlier in the lecture in regard to the *Acta Johannis*, is interesting and suggestive, but it is more disturbing than conclusive, and the Extension students cannot fail to have been seriously disturbed by such an ending to the discussion as the following: 'The Fourth Gospel enshrines many true words of the Lord which would otherwise have been lost to us. Like precious stones, their value does not depend upon their setting, and I confidently expect that many of them will come out safe from the laboratory of modern criticism, just as they have already passed safely through the Apostle's memory and the Evangelist's literary method.' The last few pages deal with the *Gospel in Aramaic*, in which Mr. Burkitt insists on the importance of examining the leading ideas of the Gospels as preserved in the Greek, and seeing what are their

¹ The reference on p. 50 to this book should be 102, not 182. On the last line of p. 56 Irenæus is misspelt. Occasionally the English might be more careful, as on p. 10: 'Dr. Hort regarded the majority . . . or to have been.'

Arama
Worte
some
and in
and d
the D

Eatin
to
El

THIS
been
opin
be so
Pray
again
certa
of th
medi
is sp
the 1
langu
than
acco
part
him
flesh
way
and
betw
the J
were
of th
fully
The
wor
a m
exp
the
the
beli
as i
of h
such
and
of k
by
eve
of t
My
wri

Aramaic equivalents, in the way Professor Dalman has done in his *Worte Jesu*. In the first of two appendices Mr. Burkitt deals at some length with the evidence for and against the *Pericope Adultera*, and in the second he gives the prologue from the *Codex Bezae Cantabrigiae*, and discusses its relation to Jerome's statements as to St. John in the *De Viris Illustribus*.

Eating the Bread of Life, a study of John vi. 30, &c., and its relation to the Lord's Supper. By W. H. K. SOAMES, M.A. (London: Elliot Stock, 1901.)

THIS 'pamphlet' of nearly two hundred closely printed pages has been undertaken because the author has 'for some time been of the opinion that the New Testament doctrine of the Lord's Supper might be somewhat more exactly set forth than it has been done in the Prayer-book and Articles, *i.e.* that the modern reaction and rebellion against the doctrinal statements of the Prayer-book and Articles has a certain amount of justification.' At the same time, in the paragraph of the preface which precedes that quoted, sacerdotalism, or the mediaeval theory of the 'real presence'—we are not clear which—is spoken of as 'not only unscriptural, but most deadly error.' In the main, Mr. Soames's method is to examine very precisely the language of the sixth chapter of St. John, to which he devotes more than a third of his pamphlet, and then to compare it with the account of the institution of the Lord's Supper, with which a large part of the rest is concerned. His examination of St. John vi. leads him (p. 64) to conclude that the expression there found—*eating the flesh of the Son of Man and drinking His blood*—is only a figurative way of saying *He that believeth on Me hath (already) everlasting life*, and that 'there is absolutely *no difference* in meaning, or in result,' between *eating the flesh of the Son of Man given for us*, and *believing on the Son of Man lifted up for us*. The acts of eating and drinking were therefore 'quite capable of performance before the institution of the Lord's Supper,' and 'would have been as capable of being fully performed if the Lord's Supper had never been instituted.' There is all through the volume an endeavour to examine the actual words of the Gospel, combined with a curious reading into them of a meaning which the New Testament does not at any rate state expressly. The result—as in the statement just quoted, that 'eating the flesh of the Son of Man does not differ in meaning from believing on the Son of Man'—is not to elucidate, but to confuse, as it seems to us. We cannot follow Mr. Soames into all the detail of his argument or into his position in regard to the use of reason in such matters as those with which he is dealing. He seems to try and reduce everything to 'logical demonstration,' but the weakness of language and of Mr. Soames's use of it in such matters is illustrated by the very irritating number of italicized words which are strewn on every page to help to make the argument clear. As an illustration of the argument, in regard to the meaning of the phrase 'This is My body,' we may quote the following:—'If a man were told to write down "Evil be to him that evil thinks," and he were to write

Honi soit qui mal y pense, would he not have *done* that which he was told to do? *I.e.* would not the writing down of *Honi soit*, &c., be precisely the *same* thing as writing 'Evil be to him, &c. . . .' It is perfectly true to say that *Honi soit*, &c., is Evil be to him that evil thinks.' We cannot deny that Mr. Soames is perfectly fearless in the conclusions to which his arguments lead him. He does not hesitate to say that the definition of a sacrament given in the Catechism is unsound, or that, 'according to the New Testament, the Sacrament of Baptism occupies a *far more prominent and important* place in the Christian dispensation than does the "Sacrament" of the Lord's supper.' But he is too dogmatic, and *if* he appeals to the verbal argument, he must not allow himself to be led away from it by figurative or other applications of the *ipsissima verba* of scripture.

Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament. By F. G. KENYON. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1901)

THIS book will immediately take its place as the best of its kind by an English writer. It is exactly fitted for its purpose, which is, according to the Preface, to provide a serviceable handbook to the textual criticism of the New Testament.

The first six chapters deal with the materials for the criticism of the text, and in this Dr. Kenyon gives, what is not to be found conveniently anywhere else, a full account of the various papyri fragments which have been discovered of late years in Egypt. For the rest, the description of the vellum uncials is excellent, and quite as full as is likely to be needed by any but advanced students of the text. It might, however, have been well to point out in connexion with the Codex Bezae that the arguments of Mr. Brightman really have but a slight bearing on the *provenance*, as distinct from the history, of the manuscript. They make it probable that the Codex was in S. Italy at the time when the liturgical annotations were made, but they do not necessarily suggest that the manuscript was originally written in S. Italy, for the earliest liturgical, not textual, annotator did not do his work before the ninth century. Dr. Kenyon is inclined to reject Mr. Brightman's view because 'we want a locality where Latin was the prevailing tongue, but Greek was still sufficiently known to make it desirable to have copies of the Scriptures in their original language as well as in a translation.' That is true if we are discussing the *provenance* of the manuscript, but not if we are talking of its history. The liturgical annotators never touch the Latin side of the Codex, and so far as they go, they point clearly to the presence of the Codex Bezae in the ninth century in a locality where the Greek rite and language exclusively obtained. S. Italy, in the ninth century, was just such a place, and there is no reason why the Codex should not have been used there. This is, of course, a distinct question from the one which Dr. Kenyon raises when he suggests that S. Italy was, in the sixth century, too much a Greek-speaking country for Codex Bezae to have been written there. But does not he read into the condition of S. Italy in the sixth century a

state
evid
was a
probab
war, r
inscri
there,
as a
doubt
as the
In
clear
theori
a mat
of his
kinds
text,
one c
are to
But it
found
his s
who
notati
of an
or lat
two to
Easte
recogn
schola
think
to fac
chose
W
will a
ment,
the N

Ceren

l
f
e
l

A G
need
privat
volum
VO

state of things which only existed either earlier or later? The evidence is not very good, but, such as it is, it suggests that S. Italy was a Latin-speaking country until at least the sixth century and probably later. Procopius, for instance, in his history of the Gothic war, regards S. Italy as Latin not Greek. There are some fine Latin inscriptions of the fifth century at Tropea, and elsewhere; nor is there, as far as we know, any certain evidence for regarding S. Italy as a Greek-speaking country during the sixth century, though, no doubt, there were some Greek-speaking people in S. Italy then, just as there are even now.

In the second part of the book, Dr. Kenyon gives an exceedingly clear account of the growth of textual criticism, and the prevailing theories. Some will think he is too conservative, but that is largely a matter of opinion, and no one can deny the fairness and clearness of his statements. He has introduced, in speaking of the different kinds of text, the notation α text, β text, &c., instead of Antiochian text, neutral text, &c. This system has some advantages. It removes one cause of the bewilderment which beginners experience when they are told that the Western text was predominately used in the East. But it also has its disadvantages. In reading Dr. Kenyon's book we found it very hard to remember that his β text is Blass's α text, and his δ text is W. H.'s β text. Of course this will not affect students who begin by reading Dr. Kenyon's book, but the variety of notations adopted by different scholars adds greatly to the obscurity of an already rather complex subject. Besides, very probably sooner or later scholars will have recognised that the *Western* text is really two texts, a truly Western text represented by the Old Latin, and an Eastern text represented by the Old Syriac. When that fact is recognized in nomenclature, as it is already in practice, by many scholars, we shall have to divide the δ text, and we are inclined to think that *Eastern* and *Western*, names which will really correspond to facts, will be preferable to δ and ϵ or whatever other letter may be chosen.

We hope that Dr. Kenyon's book will be widely used, and that it will attract more attention to the textual criticism of the New Testament, for the importance of textual criticism is probably greater in the New Testament than in most classical authors.

II.—LITURGIES.

Ceremonies and Processions of the Cathedral Church of Salisbury.

Edited from the Fifteenth-Century MS. No. 148, with Additions from the Cathedrals Records and Woodcuts from the *Sarum Processionale* of 1502. By CHR. WORDSWORTH, M.A., Master of St. Nicholas's Hospital, Sarum. (Cambridge: at the University Press, 1901.)

A good and critical edition of the *Sarum Processionale* is much needed. The reprint of Dean Henderson (Leeds, 1882) was privately issued, and is now very scarce, and Mr. Wordsworth's new volume does not take its place. Moreover there are several points

which give the Processional a special interest : it was the last of the service books to be evolved, and is to a considerable extent built up out of material drawn from elsewhere ; therefore an account of its origin and the tracing of its component part would lead to interesting studies : also such items as were not borrowed from the Antiphonal, Gradual, &c., consist for the most part of picturesque rites of an exceptional kind, which have an attraction of their own and are quite independent of the general interests of the Divine Service or the Mass or the other Sacramental Rites : such services as those peculiar to Palm Sunday, Maundy Thursday, Good Friday, and Easter Even, which, with the Candlemas rites, form the nucleus of the whole Processional, deserve now such study and exposition as the present state of comparative liturgiology is at last qualified to give, or at least to begin to give ; and such studies as these ought to precede the much-needed recovery of some at least of these services for modern Anglican use.

Mr. Wordsworth in the present volume does not give us this *desideratum*, but he gives us a valuable contribution towards it. One-third of his volume is taken up with a Salisbury manuscript, which well deserves publication, and he has added to its value by supplying so far as possible two lamentable lacunæ, by adding valuable footnotes and incorporating in an improved form the curious woodcuts elucidatory of the ceremonial, which had already been reproduced by Dr. Henderson in his reprint. This first part is undoubtedly the most satisfactory ; a clear idea is gained of the manuscript, and its history and scope are well expounded. It does not cover the same ground as the ordinary printed Processional ; for, to mention one point, it only deals with the close of the procession on ordinary occasions, not with the whole course of it, but on the other hand it gives specially full directions in places where the regular Processional is silent.

A Service Book is always more interesting in proportion as it can be run to earth ; and such a speciality of interest this manuscript undoubtedly possesses, for it belongs to the Salisbury Cathedral Church itself, and every page is full of local colour and of special points.

The rest of the volume is taken up with more miscellaneous material : much of it is very valuable, but it is difficult to keep a steady course through it ; even when a solid and substantial dissertation on the subject of the Chapels and Altars of the Cathedral Church is reached, and the reader begins to congratulate himself on having recovered his way, he is again bewildered by finding that through an unfortunate mistake the notes to it have been printed from a wrong draught, and that an appendix of supplementary notes must also be consulted.

We have not got, then, a new edition of the Processional, still less that new and critical edition of it which is needed, but we have got a very valuable mass of materials, the product of much labour on Mr. Wordsworth's part and many researches and a most generous communicativeness on the part of Mr. A. R. Malden, the Salisbury

Regi
indis
have
page
give

two
Kale
broth
tion.
pang
and
large
he w
but
prov

The
I
V

CAN
beer
othe
has
addi
valu
Book
Ster
The
the
some
wide
soon
revis
early
mis
pres
ago,
of ar
loud
view
only
not
men
Cree
are
allow
I
is n
sition

Registrar. Students of the Salisbury Rites will find these materials indispensable, and the future editor of the ideal Processional will have to work systematically through them and utilize them on every page of his final and definitive edition. When will he arise and give us the fascinating volume that our soul desires?

Instead of sighing it will perhaps be better to point out one or two special things of interest in this collection of documents. The Kalendar is noteworthy, and later on in the volume there is its twin brother the Obit Kalendar of the Cathedral, which is full of fascination. The Inventories, again, cannot be read without a delightful pang of regret, and the elucidation of the topography of Cathedral and Chapter House is of great value. These are only a few of the larger items; for the rest we must refer the reader to the book itself: he will probably complain of the disordered state of the bill of fare, but he will be obliged to acknowledge that he has a rich banquet provided for him.

The Prayer Book: its History, Language, and Contents. By EVAN DANIEL, M.A. Twentieth edition, revised and enlarged. (London: Wells Gardner & Co., 1901.)

CANON DANIEL'S book has long had a position of its own, and has been proved of value to many generations of school teachers and others; it has now reached its twentieth edition, and the opportunity has been taken of revising and adding to its contents. The main addition is a section of 120 pages on the Articles, which, however valuable in itself, is out of place in a book dealing with the Prayer Book, since the Articles are no more part of the Prayer Book than Sternhold and Hopkins's *Psalms* or *Hymns Ancient and Modern*. The preface of the new edition points also to other new matters—the Latin Canon of the Mass, some reports of Convocation, and some Catenas which are of very varying degrees of value—and to a wide-reaching work of revision. Unfortunately a study of the book soon brings disappointment in this respect, and shows that the revision has not been nearly drastic enough; in the account of early and mediæval liturgies there are serious blunders or wholly misleading statements left surviving on nearly every page, some representing the state of liturgical knowledge some thirty or forty years ago, and some not even that. It seems a churlish thing to speak thus of an old friend, but the fact is undeniable; and when the public is loudly informed that the book has been revised up to date a reviewer who deems this claim unjustifiable in common honesty can only warn the public that he does not find it so. Moreover this is not only the case with mere technicalities of scholarship or refinements of ancient history; such matters as the *Te Deum* and the Creeds are not dealt with as they deserve, two inconsistent accounts are given of the *Nunc dimittis*, and many other such blemishes are allowed to remain, to the great bewilderment of the reader.

It is true, no doubt, that the main value of Canon Daniel's book is not touched by these points, for it is principally useful as an exposition of the Prayer Book and an explanation of its language; but

unquestionably a great opportunity has been realized only to be lost, and students of this work, if they pursue their studies further, will unfortunately have to unlearn a good deal that they have learnt. For old friendship's sake we cannot but wish it a really revised twenty-first edition.

The Blessing of the Waters on the Eve of the Epiphany: the Greek, Latin, Syriac, Coptic, and Russian Versions, edited or translated from the Original Texts. The Latin by JOHN, MARQUESS OF BUTE, K.T., the rest for him, and with his help in part, by E. A. WALLIS BUDGE, M.A., Litt. D., D. Lit. (London: H. Frowde, 1901.)

As appears from the title, this volume is a collection of most of the existing orders for the consecration of water at the Epiphany—Roman, Orthodox (both Greek and Slavonic), Syrian, and Coptic—either in the original text or in translation or both. A regret may be expressed at the outset that the editors have not completed the collection by including the Armenian order; while the inclusion of the Greek order of the 'Little Consecration' seems superfluous, since it appears to have no necessary relation to the Epiphany.

Among the events commemorated by the festival, and in the East generally the most prominent among them, is the Baptism of our Lord; and the solemn blessing of water for the purposes of 'holy water' is a not unnatural element in this commemoration. All the Eastern orders conform more or less closely to a common type. The Greek order, which is clearly the original, is used after the 'prayer behind the ambo' of the liturgy on the Eve of the Epiphany, when a procession, with lights and incense and the singing of *troparia*, is made to the font. It opens with five lessons (Isa. xxxv. ; lv. ; xii. 3 to the end ; 1 Cor. x. 1-4 ; St. Mark i. 9-11), with a *prokeimenon* (Ps. xxvi. [xxvii.] 1) before the Apostle, and an *alleluia* (Ps. xxviii. [xxix.] 3) before the Gospel, and a litany, during which the priest says a prayer inaudibly, after the Gospel. The consecration follows, consisting of the poem of St. Sophronius of Jerusalem, 'O super-essential Trinity,' as a 'prologue,' if desired, and the prayer 'Great art Thou, O Lord,' being an act of praise commemorating the creation, visible and invisible, and our Lord's Incarnation and Baptism, passing into a prayer for the consecration of the water, appealing to the renewal of man by water and Spirit, the Flood, the passage of the Red Sea, and Elijah on Carmel, and ending with an invocation of the Holy Ghost, a prayer for the benefit of the use of the water, an intercession, and a doxology. After a prayer of inclination our Lord's baptism is symbolically commemorated by the baptism of the Cross in the consecrated water during the singing of the *apolytikion* of the Epiphany, 'Εν Ἱορδάνῃ βαπτίζομένου σου. The people are then sprinkled with the water, and the procession returns from the font, while an *idiomelon* is sung, and the liturgy is concluded by the distribution of the *antidoron* during the singing of Ps. xxxiii. (xxxiv.)

The Syriac order is given in two forms, a longer (described in

the manuscript as translated from the Greek) and a shorter, which is perhaps an abridgment of the longer.¹ The order opens with an anthem (Ps. lxxvii. 16) and a series of lessons, according to the longer form seven in number (Ex. xv. 22-25, 4 Reg. ii. 19-22, Ezek. xlvii. 1-12, Isa. xi. 11-xii. 6, Acts viii. 26-39, Heb. x. 15-25, St. John iv. 24). After the Gospel a procession with lights and incense and the singing of anthems is made to the river or pool or well to be blessed, the deacon carrying a vessel in which some of the water is to be brought back. Arrived at the water, the deacon recites a litany, after which the priest recites a 'prayer of incense.' In the shorter form the Creed follows; and after this the consecration proceeds. In the shorter form this consists of two long prayers, one of which is the 'Great art Thou, O Lord,' and a formula of signing the water; while the longer form adds three more prayers. After the consecration, while the *Trisagion* is sung, the priest 'draws the water,' *i.e.* he fills the vessel. After a concluding prayer the procession returns to the church, and the vessel of consecrated water is deposited on or near the altar till the Mass has been celebrated.

The Coptic order, after the manner of Coptic rites, is closely assimilated to the structure of the Mass. After 'the thanksgiving,' 'the prayer of incense,' the Lord's Prayer, and *Miserere*, ten lessons are read (Hab. iii. 1-19; Isa. xxxv. 2; xl. 1-5; ix. 1, 2; lvii. 15, 16; Bar. iii. 35-37, iv. 1-4; Ezek. xxxvi. 25-29; xlvii. 1-9; 1 Cor. x. 1-13; St. Matt. iii. 1-17) with a 'psalm' (Ps. cxiii. [cxiv.] 3, 5) before, and a litany after, the Gospel; after which the kiss of peace is given with the usual accompaniments, and the priest says the salutation and 'Lift up your hearts,' &c., and proceeds to the consecration, consisting of the prayer, 'Great art Thou, O Lord,' with the *Sanctus* inserted after the commemoration of the angelic hierarchy. The Lord's Prayer follows, with its embolism; then a prayer of inclination, the signation of the water, with the formula 'One holy Father' &c., and Ps. cl. The people 'take a blessing from the waters,' *i.e.* receive some of it to drink and to carry away, and anthems are sung meanwhile; and the office concludes with a prayer of thanksgiving.

It will easily be seen that these rites are fundamentally identical, and consist of a Mass of the Catechumens, extended, according to the custom of vigils, by the multiplication of lessons; followed by the consecration, the essential element of which is the prayer, 'Great art Thou, O Lord.'

The Roman order is essentially similar in type, however much this similarity is disguised by what looks like accretion. After the Compline of the Eve or the ninth lesson of the Mattins of the festival, a procession moves to where the vessel of water stands, with lights and incense and a responsory; Pss. xxviii. (xxix.), lxxviii. (lxxix.), xc. (xci.) with their antiphons, a second responsory, and the Litany with special suffrages follow, and after this a prayer of exorcism over the water. After a lesson (Numb. xx. 2-6), a sort of Gradual and Alleluia, and a Gospel (St. John vii. 37-39a), the priest recites three

¹ Another Syriac order, with differences of detail, is given in M. Ant. Marsil. Columna, *Hydragiologia sive de aqua benedicta*, Rome, 1586.

exorcisms over the water, and three over the salt, and commixes the two with *Haec commixtio*, and adds three more exorcisms over the mixture. After *Dominus vobiscum*, *Sursum corda*, &c., he recites a proper preface, in the middle of which he exorcizes the water once more and baptizes the Cross, which is brought to him from the sacristy by a 'godfather' in solemn procession. The *Sanctus* follows the preface, and then another exorcism, and a post-sanctus beginning—and this is interesting—in Gallican form, *Vere sanctus*, leading up to the Lord's Prayer with *Libera nos*. The water is sprinkled on the people while *Asperges me* is sung; a second Gospel (St. Luke iii. 21–iv. 7) and *Te Deum* follow; and two sets of short *præces* with collects and the sprinkling of the church with the water conclude the rite.

It is clear that this office is constructed roughly after the pattern of a procession followed by a Mass; only the enormous multiplication of intercalated exorcisms destroys its simplicity and dislocates its structure.

The editors have not attempted to write the history of the ceremony, and have confined themselves to a few facts given in the table of contents. Nor would it be easy to write such a history without investigations which would not perhaps repay the trouble they would demand. In the East the night of the Epiphany naturally became a season of solemn baptisms, and perhaps tended to eclipse Easter night in this respect. Its title, *Tà φῶτα*, was derived from the torches of the neophytes and their symbolic relation to the sacrament of 'illumination.' When special seasons of baptism became practically obsolete our Lord's baptism was still commemorated, and the solemn baptisms would seem to have left traces of themselves in two forms. The bathing of pilgrims in the Jordan on the Epiphany is a well-known instance of one form of the survival, and the Nestorian custom of bathing in a pool is another.¹ The second form is found in the rites of consecrating holy water. Already in the fourth century at Antioch the people carried away some of the water of the founts to serve as holy water for the year (S. Chrys. *Hom. 24 de Bapt. Christi*), just as they may be seen to do on Easter Even on the Continent at the present day; and the rites under discussion would seem to be a survival and adaptation of the old custom. The Copts till a century or two ago combined both forms, the people plunging into the water after its consecration in the 'Epiphany tank.'² The Greek order, from which the others are certainly derived, is at least as old as the end of the eighth century, since it occurs approximately in its present form, except that the lessons are only three and the baptism of the Cross seems to be wanting, in the Barberini *Euchologion* of about 795 A.D.;³ and its style would probably justify us in regarding it as at least two centuries older. And Dr. Budge shows reason (p. vii) for supposing that the Syriac version was made by the indefatigable James of Edessa in about 700 A.D.

¹ Maclean and Browne, *The Catholicos of the East and his People*, p. 334.

² Butler, *The Ancient Coptic Churches of Egypt*, ii. p. 346.

³ Goar, *Euchologion*, ed. 1730, p. 375.

When the Epiphany was accepted in the West the Baptism of our Lord took a secondary place among its commemorations, the first place being taken by the visit of the Magi; and though for a time it was treated in Africa and the Gauls as a season of solemn baptism, the Roman See set its face against this usage, and it was in time abolished. And there seems to be no reason to suppose that the blessing of the waters is a survival of any obsolete Western use; rather it was probably a comparatively late borrowing from Greek custom, and may well have originated in South Italy, which belonged to the Byzantine Empire and the patriarchate of Constantinople till the Norman Conquest, while the Greek rite and mixed Greek and Latin rites survived, and in fact survive till the present moment. The Latin order found its way into the Roman *Rituale* in the sixteenth century, and though it was not covered by Paul V's approbation of the reformed *Rituale* it continued to be included in it till it was prohibited by the Decree of the Congregation of Rites of January 11, 1725; and even after this it continued to be printed in some editions till the end of the eighteenth century. It was criticized by Lambertini even before he discovered that it had not the approval of Paul V, and though he disclaimed the intention of reproaching it as a whole and confined his criticism to certain points in it, and after he became Pope (Benedict XIV) would not have bishops abolish it where it was popular and of long-standing use, it seems clear that he did not like it.¹ It continued in use till a few years ago in the church of S. Andrea della Valle; and it was Lord Bute's assistance at the rite in this church which seems to have suggested to him the publication of the present volume. In 1890 a new and simpler form, which is in fact only the ordinary office for the blessing of water in a new setting, was approved by the Congregation, and is printed in the modern editions of the *Rituale Romanum*.² The old form was contained in several local *Ritualia*, e.g. those of Venice,³ Osimo,⁴ Gran,⁵ and Freising;⁶ while at Nardo there was a mixed Greek and Latin order, a conflate of the Greek and the Roman rites.⁷ In the *Ritualia* of Brixen⁸ and Regensburg⁹ the rite is assigned not to the Epiphany, but to St. Stephen's Day, and the order is simpler.

Perhaps none of these offices will much commend themselves to English readers, however sympathetic. The claims implied for the effectiveness of the consecrated waters will seem excessive for what is at best a mere 'sacramental.' The worst of them in this respect

¹ See Dichlich, *Dizionario sacro liturgico*, i. 2nd ed., Venice, 1824, s.v. 'Aqua.'

² E.g. ed. Tournai, 1898.

³ See *Rito Veneto antico detto Patriarchino illustrato* (Dichlich, u.s.).

⁴ Luc. Fanciulli, *Di alcuni antichi riti della cattedrale di Osimo*, Rome, 1805.

⁵ *Rituale Strigoniense*, Buda-Pesth, 1858, p. 323.

⁶ *Rituale Frisingense*, 1673, p. 439.

⁷ Seb. Paoli, *De Ritu ecclesiae Neritensis exorcisandae aquae in Epiphania*, Naples, 1719.

⁸ *Sacerdotalis Brixienis pars altera*, Brixen, 1710, p. 222.

⁹ *Rituale Ratisbonense*, Salzburg, 1673, p. 335.

is the older Roman order, with its laboured exorcisms and rather extravagant petitions ; and perhaps no one will regret its abolition.

The editing of the present volume is scarcely satisfactory. We have already regretted its incompleteness in not including the Armenian order, and we may add that it is not obvious why the Slavonic text is not given ; and if a translation of the Latin was called for, why not still more a translation of the Greek ? The original texts do not seem to be open to criticism, but the translations are sometimes deplorable. That of the Latin is slovenly, and sometimes misleading ; e.g. throughout *exorcizo* is extraordinarily rendered 'command,' while *exhibere* scarcely means 'manifest' as here used, nor is *salutare sacramentum* adequately rendered by 'a mystery of health.' The other translations are careless and sometimes quite wrong : e.g. a passage in the Coptic (p. 127) rendered, 'Thou art He through whom in the beginning the powers of the understanding were disturbed,' whatever that may mean, is a perfectly simple translation of the Greek (p. 145) *ὅτι τρέπονται αἱ νοεραὶ . . . θυνάμεις* (the Angels to wit).

Pontifical Services. Illustrated from Miniatures of the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries. With Descriptive Notes and a Liturgical Introduction by WALTER HOWARD FRERE, Priest of the Community of the Resurrection. 2 vols. (*Alcuin Club Collections*, Vols. III. and IV.). (London : Longmans, Green and Co., 1901.)

THE two volumes of *Collections* issued by the Alcuin Club for 1899-1900, unlike as they are in other respects, agree in this, that both alike illustrate the services of the mediæval Pontificals. The first of the two appeals more especially to those who approach the services from the point of view of liturgical history, with the desire to understand their structure and to see how they came to be what they are ; the other more especially to those who look on them from the archæological or even the artistic side, with the desire to understand the nature and the mode of performing the acts directed by the rubrics. In his liturgical introduction Mr. Frere confines himself almost entirely to two forms of service not now represented in the English Prayer-book. He deals in the first place with the Order for the Consecration of Churches, and shows how the ceremonies of translating and enclosing relics and the preliminary ceremonies for preparing the altar and the church for their reception have been conjoined with 'the one universal and unvarying feature of the whole history,' the celebration of the Eucharist by the bishop in the new church ; and how the different types of service-books have each contributed to the making of the form. So in the case of the Profession of Nuns he shows how the original conception of the consecration of virginity has been somewhat obscured by the combination with it of ideas drawn from the monastic profession, and the addition of other elements, symbolic or dramatic, which formed no part of the original tradition, but found a place in the order at an early date. He has, in fact, aimed at doing for these services what he has

done elsewhere for the forms of Ordination, and he has fulfilled his object with more detailed method, and with equal clearness and success. On the subject of the consecration of churches, moreover, he draws from his work some practical suggestions, such as it is to be hoped may result in greater uniformity of practice than now prevails in the Church of England. Of the second volume it may be said that it supplies an abundance, perhaps a disproportionate abundance, of illustrations of the Ordination services; and that most of the services represented in the Pontificals find some representation. The plates are taken in the main from the Corpus Christi College MS. 79, apparently begun for a bishop of St. Davids, finished (as regards the bulk of its contents) for Clifford, Bishop of London, in the early years of the fifteenth century, and supplemented some years later when in the possession of Philip Morgan, bishop, first of Worcester, and afterwards of Ely. The Lansdowne MS. 451, also apparently the book of a fifteenth-century bishop of London, supplies another series. The sixteenth-century book of Bishop Longland, of Lincoln, furnishes two plates, and a German Pontifical (B.M. MS. Add. 14805) supplies a good series of illustrations of the ceremonies of Ordination. The descriptions and explanations accompanying the plates are very full and clear. The plates themselves are of somewhat unequal merit, probably because the miniatures, by reason of their colouring or their distinctness were not all equally good subjects for photography. But on the whole the series is good; and the two volumes, taken together, form an important contribution to the study of the Pontificals.

Forms of Prayer with Thanksgiving to Almighty God; for use in all Churches and Chapels within this Realm, every Year, upon the Anniversary of the day of the Accession of the Reigning Sovereign, or upon such other day as shall be appointed by Authority. (London: J. B. Nichols, 1901.)

THE new form of Accession Service which has at last been issued is a great improvement on its predecessor. The objectionable features have been removed and the whole has been given a fresh turn through being permissory so far as the Divine Service is concerned; at the Eucharist, however, where there is no question of breaking in upon the continuity of Psalms and Lessons, the use of the special Collect, Epistle, and Gospel is prescribed. Three of the old prayers are retained; one—viz., the Prayer for Unity—is unaltered, but the other two have been much pruned and amended. In place of the old Collect there is provided an adaptation of the Coronation prayer *Deus qui populis tuis*. Unfortunately this adaptation is very clumsily done, and suffers from that disease which besets many like attempts, viz. the tendency to wander off into phrases which properly belong to some other position in the services; in the course of the two and a half lines here inserted there are reminiscences of two passages in the Prayerbook, which are wholly alien to the prayer, and have a most jarring effect. It is a great pity that the service should be defaced by such a hybrid as is the resultant of these operations.

This Collect is rightly printed with its full doxology as the Collect of the Communion Service, but, where it is printed to be used as a Memorial 'after the first Collect at Morning or Evening Prayer,' it should, according to old rule and the analogy of the Prayerbook, have been printed without its full ending.

A new feature and a valuable one is the provision of a third form of service consisting of *Te Deum*, Lesser Litany, Lord's Prayer, Suffrages, and Collects, and concluding with the Blessing. It will be noticed that the subdivision of the *Te Deum* has been amended, but not the subdivision of the Lord's Prayer. It is probable that this service will become the most general form of commemorating the anniversary.

Order for Special Services, authorized by the Most Reverend the ARCHBISHOP OF CAPETOWN and METROPOLITAN for Use in His Own Diocese, and . . . throughout the Province of South Africa, on the Day of the Coronation of His Majesty King Edward VII. (London, Capetown, and Aberdeen, N.B., 1901.)

WE can heartily congratulate the Archbishop of Capetown on having issued such an excellent order to be used by the Church of South Africa on the coming Coronation Day. The main features are, first, a special service consisting of *Veni Creator*, the Litany, and the more important prayers out of the old Coronation Service; and, secondly, a special order for the Communion Service, with the collects, epistle, gospel, and anthems from the *Liber Regalis*. The versions of the prayers are dignified and rhythmical, and they are all, with the exception of the proper preface and post-common, based upon those used at the coronation of James I. We have no hesitation in saying that this order might be used with great advantage on the Coronation Day throughout the Empire. It may be noted also that Mr. Macpherson, of St. Paul's, has written easy music for the anthems, so that such choirs as cannot grapple with Handel's elaborate settings will be able to sing some of the same anthems as are sung in Westminster Abbey during the great solemnity.

The Confirmation and Communion of Infants and Young Children. By the Rev. HENRY HOLLOWAY. With a Preface by the Right Hon. VISCOUNT HALIFAX, President of the English Church Union. London: Skeffington and Son, 1901.)

IT is well known to scholars that the custom of the Primitive Church, as of the Eastern Churches at the present time, was to confirm and give Communion to infants as well as to baptize them. This, however, is unknown to very many Church people; and it has been carefully ignored by not a few who have had knowledge of it. The author of the book under review has attempted to put an end to this ignorance of, and ignoring of, an important fact. Without being himself a scholar or an historian, as is obvious from his book, he knows the results and conclusions of critical and historical investigation on this subject; and he has shown, in a method which will appeal to many readers who have not opportunity or capacity for

much study, that the rule of the Church of England which requires knowledge of the Church Catechism from any before they may be confirmed is a grave departure from the practice of the Primitive Church. He points out, still more emphatically, and occasionally in terms which show more indignation than caution, that the ordinary custom of the English bishops as to the age for Confirmation is a further departure from primitive practice even than the rule of the English Church. Without advocating any immediate restoration of the primitive practice, he urges that, at the least, the rule of the Church of England should be complied with, and children 'brought to the bishop to be confirmed by him so soon as they can say the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments,' 'and be further instructed in the Church Catechism set forth for that purpose.' It is difficult to resist the conclusion that either the formularies of the Church of England ought to be altered by proper authority or bishops should cease to insist on age qualifications for Confirmation in violation of the Book of Common Prayer.

Mr. Holloway's book is enriched by a Preface from Lord Halifax. It is dedicated to Mr. Athelstan Riley. The frontispiece consists of an interesting photograph of a fifteenth-century font in the parish church of Gresham in Norfolk, representing the Confirmation of infants.

Studies in Ceremonial. Essays illustrative of English ceremonial.

By the Rev. VERNON STALEY, Author of *The Ceremonial of the English Church*, &c. (Oxford and London: Mowbray and Co., 1901.)

THIS little book contains eleven short essays, the subjects of which are 'Genuflections at the Consecration of the Eucharist,' 'Signing with the Cross at the Creed,' 'The Position of the Reader of the Liturgical Epistle,' 'The Posture of the Hearers of the Liturgical Epistle,' 'Bowing at the Name of Jesus,' 'Bowing towards the Altar,' 'The Altar-Frontal,' 'The Altar-Lights,' 'The Silken Chalice-Veil,' 'The Chalice-Pall,' and 'The Biretta.'

The essays are very carefully and clearly written. They contain a large amount of information on the subjects with which they deal. As a piece of historical and antiquarian work, Mr. Staley's book is likely to be very useful and is worthy of much praise.

We cannot say we are altogether in sympathy with the tone of parts of *Studies in Ceremonial*, or with the apparent object of the writer in the publication of it. Mr. Staley and others who, as we understand, give practical effect in the ordering of their churches to the principles of which he is an advocate, appear to us to exaggerate the need of conformity in the ceremonial of the present day to that in use in the first half of the sixteenth century. We cannot think it either required by the law of the English Church or in itself expedient that the ceremonial of our churches should be in a large number of matters an exact reproduction of that which existed in A.D. 1548. The 'Ornaments Rubric' is unduly pressed when it is taken to mean, not only that, for instance, the use of Vestments,

Altar-Lights, and the Censer is lawful in the Church of England, but also that the Vestments are to be of the exact pattern, the Altar Lights of the exact number, and the Censer used in exactly the same way as in the 'second year of the reign of King Edward VI.' And, while a general resemblance in some matters of ceremonial may be of value in illustrating the continuity between the existing Church of England and that of earlier times, the same value cannot reasonably be attached to an exact correspondence as to details. Signs of the common possession of life and belief and ordinances of grace by the Church of England and the Church of Rome and the Eastern Churches at the present time are no less important than such marks of continuity; and considerations of utility as well as of ceremonial tradition ought to be taken into account.

III.—CHURCH HISTORY.

The Development of Doctrine from the early Middle Ages to the Reformation. By JOHN S. BANKS. (London: Charles H. Kelly, 1901.)

PROFESSOR BANKS endeavours, within two hundred and fifty pages, to sketch the development of doctrine during thirteen centuries of Christian history. Beginning with Gregory the Great, he leaves his readers at the Vatican Council. His book is based mainly upon the works of Seeberg and Loofs, with references to Harnack, Fisher, and other writers. The task of compilation has, we think, been very ably performed. The book suffers, naturally, from its extreme compression. This is felt especially in the earlier half, in which the author essays to treat the scientific theology of the Middle Ages within a compass hardly greater than that allotted afterwards to Luther and Calvin only. Such an enterprise is of course difficult; nor is its success much to be desired. It represents, surely, a great distortion of historical perspective. It is true that the author has endeavoured to free himself from the antique grudge against the Schoolmen.

'We need not agree with the harsh judgment once passed on scholasticism as "revealed metaphysics." Excessive as was the attention paid to form, the substance of divine truth was not wholly forgotten. Incarnation and redemption may have been overlaid with theory and definition, but they were believed in as saving truth. Nor can we fail to recognise and honour the lofty motives which animated the greatest teachers in the long series—their passion for truth, their vast erudition, their strenuous faith and industry and invincible patience. They succeeded as completely as men could with their light and on their methods' (p. 123).

Yet the author's estimate of their success may be gathered from the following: 'With the Reformation a new era opens in Christian history. The interpretation of Scripture, the views taken of Christian life and doctrine, underwent a transformation. We feel at once that we breathe different air and see everything in a different light' (p. 125). The author is content to rejoice in that light. He assumes the greatest question to which his subject gives rise, the substantial

soundness of Luther's position. 'We cannot wonder that Luther's discovery of truth was gradual' (p. 127). Now if it were true, and universally acknowledged, that Luther and Calvin had 'discovered truth,' and had, by their single force, lifted theology clean from its old hinges, the attention paid to them in this book would not be disproportionate. But they were emphatically men who knew in part; their influence was confined and partial; it bore powerfully upon particular doctrines: it told upon particular races; it did not embrace theology as a whole or move Christendom as a whole. It is the conception of Christian doctrine as a whole which is chiefly lacking in these pages. Of the forms assumed by different doctrines at different periods we hear a great deal; but of the mediæval conception of theology as a vast universe of truth, with all its parts in harmonious relation, no impression at all is given us. And yet it is only in view of this their master principle that the Middle Ages, whether as regards faith or morals, can be conceived with justice. For it was to this principle, of the unity of life and truth, that the Middle Age made, not only its noblest, but its most disastrous sacrifices. Neither of the dominance nor of the disappearance of this principle does the author of this book seem conscious. Indeed it has been the work of thoroughgoing Protestantism to destroy the very instinct to which such an ideal appeals.

In one other matter, and perhaps in one only, is the work before us open to exception. It is the author's attempt to bring the Eucharistic teaching of the Reformers into harmony with his own view of what is meant by the word 'spiritual.' It is in this direction only that the enterprise of the Reformers fails to satisfy him. 'On the nature of the two Sacraments' we are told (p. 157) 'Luther retained much of the old teaching. His unfortunate obstinacy here sprang chiefly from his regard for the literal sense of Scripture; the "is" of Matthew xxvi. 26 seemed to him to preclude any other course.' His 'obstinate' opposition to Zwingli is twice again referred to (pp. 174, 261). The author's ingenuous attempts at accommodation are not a little curious. 'Luther affirms the "eating with the mouth" (*manducatio oralis*) as much as a believer in transubstantiation could. . . . Yet Luther held transubstantiation as little as Zwingli. And this being the case he must have held the bodily presence in some special and, we should say, unreal sense' (p. 169). Yet his sense of it was so far real that, on the strength of their divergence, as is noted with regret, 'Luther would not acknowledge Zwingli as a Christian' (p. 172). In the same fashion we are told of Melancthon that 'if, as Dr. Seeberg says, he maintained "the bodily presence of Christ," it must have been in some sacramental sense' (p. 188). The oddest example of the author's solicitude in this regard occurs in his treatment of Calvin. We have followed the author's method of writing exactly:

'Calvin affirms a real presence of Christ even in his bodily nature. . . . It is not enough to speak of a spiritual fellowship with Christ; he has described his flesh and blood as actual food. . . . Yet what can this be but a spiritual presence, especially when we know that

Calvin held to the figurative interpretation of the words of institution? . . . What is meant by the real spiritual presence of a body is not clear. The difference between Luther and Calvin is that one holds a bodily, the other a spiritual presence of Christ' (pp. 225-6).

This fancied opposition between 'bodily' and 'spiritual' pervades the discussion of Eucharistic doctrine. And yet we gather from p. 170 that there is such a thing as a 'spiritual body.' We cannot resolve the author's difficulty; but may deprecate the introduction of 'must-have-beens' into the treatment of such delicate matters. It would be better to say simply that the Reformers' faith upon this vital question possessed a vigour which is almost painful to certain of their descendants.

In a concluding chapter the author asserts himself to good purpose against 'critical historians of our day' who complain of a 'contradiction between the early evangelical teaching of Luther and his later dogmatic position' (p. 257). The reference is to Professors Loofs and Harnack. He declares that there is great exaggeration in such teaching as that 'in Luther's Reformation the old dogmatic Christianity was discarded, and a new evangelical view substituted for it;' and that 'the history of dogma was brought to an end.' 'Our critics find it convenient to ignore the differences between the use and abuse of dogma.' Dogma is necessary in some form, and 'the advocates of "undogmatic" Christianity and Churches have human nature and history against them' (p. 259). 'We cannot but think that there is even greater exaggeration in much that is written about Luther's "retention of Catholic dogmas." As we have seen, the most serious case is in regard to the doctrine of the sacraments, but we know no other of equal importance. Set against this the revolution in the case of other doctrines. Really the gravamen of the charge is in the Reformers holding the necessity of a doctrinal test in the Church at all' (p. 260). Having planted his nail, the author proceeds to hammer it home.

'Would our modern critics,' he asks, 'accept the doctrines apart from the dogmas, the early Luther apart from the later one? There is nothing to indicate that they would, but much the other way. For anything that appears they differ as much from the doctrines which Luther held dearer than life as from the dogmatic utterances of the later creeds. Is it not simply throwing dust in our eyes to write as if the only quarrel were with dogma and creed, when it is really with the doctrines which the Reformers admittedly held in common with the apostles of the Lord?'

This is true, and shrewdly put.

The book is the fruit of able and careful work; we could wish it had been written from a less contracted standpoint.

The Dawn of the Reformation. By HERBERT B. WORKMAN. Vol. I. 'The Age of Wyclif.' (London: Charles H. Kelly, 1901.)

MR. WORKMAN'S little book is worthy of all praise. It belongs to the same series as the volume previously noticed, and whether as regards knowledge, judgment, or temper, it is entirely creditable to its source. Among the difficulties on account of which the author pleads indulgence is not only 'the pressure of a busy pastorate,' but that 'of

readily obtaining the necessary books. . . . As things at present exist, Manchester is the only city in which it is possible for the provincial student to find the sources he needs. This is especially unfortunate for Nonconformity. Our strength lies in provincial centres, where the intelligent study of Church history, as distinct from compilation, is almost an impossibility.' Be that as it may, Mr. Workman's book is nothing if not the outcome of intelligent study. The author has mastered his material; he has digested it fully; and is enabled to present it freshly, and with the lightness and clearness which come of grasp. He writes, too, with a detachment to which, in his view, his position as a Nonconformist well conduces. He has to treat really of the cracks and fissures of the mediæval Church system, but they are in no way to him matter of satisfaction. He tells, with interest and sympathy, a plain story, and trusts it to point its own moral. His subject constitutes an unhappy chapter, but a chapter which is completely closed. He is well content to dispose the pall of charity over a past which there is no reviving. The author has read, if not profoundly, at any rate with his eyes open, and his book has the dignity and value of a personal judgment. For a work so little ambitious in scope one cannot say more in praise.

After describing the fourteenth century as a time 'of contradictory and abortive efforts at reform standing out against a background of spiritual fatigue and defeated aspiration,' the writer sketches 'the causes of the downfall of the Papacy.' These he finds, first, in 'the virtual overthrow by the popes of the most venerable institution in the world, the Holy Roman Empire;' then in the abandonment of Rome and the shock it gave to the feeling of Christendom. The opening of the book is occupied with an account of the Papacy at Avignon, its corruption, its rapacity, the sacrifice of its supreme neutrality, and its subservience to France. A summary is given of the steps taken progressively in England to counterwork the Avignon system, culminating in the statutes of Provisors and Præmunire. This series of measures, in the view of the writer, redeems the age from barrenness. 'In her canon law the Papacy had found the anvil upon which she had forged her claims. The canon law,' he declares most truly, 'was a part of the very *esse* of the mediæval Church. To weaken its hold, to deny its authority, was in itself to prepare for the disappearance of that Church. This was precisely the task that the great statutes of the fourteenth century accomplished' (pp. 55-6). A chapter entitled 'Seers and Dreamers' describes the political enterprises of Pope John XXII. and the ferment of contemporary thought as represented by Dante, Marsiglio of Padua, and William of Ockham. In connexion with this some pages are given to 'the revolt of the Spiritual Franciscans.' In the latter and larger part of the book we are introduced to the Oxford of Wyclif, the strife between seculars and regulars, Nominalists and Realists; and shown how 'Wyclif's Realism lay at the root of all his views of the Church.' The author's judgment of Scholasticism is declared as follows:

'This great movement had, in earlier years—the age of Anselm and Abailard—brought deliverance to the human mind, the opening of the

eyes of the blind, and the reconciliation of reason and faith. Her energies were now exhausted, her vital force spent. If in common repute Scholasticism, unjustly, stands damned for ever, the cause must be found in the worse than uselessness of her latter days. History has too often forgotten her splendid services in the abiding memory of her servile follies and parrot repetitions. As an intellectual movement, her work finished with Ockham. Even Wyclif, judged as a Schoolman, does little more than gyrate on a well-beaten path' (pp. 147-8).

In the course of a very good and brief account of Wyclif's opinions, there appears a judgment which we think unfortunate. 'Wyclif's break with the Papacy was part of a new idea that he had formed of the Church. The politician had become a Presbyterian reformer for whom the whole ecclesiastical position was at fault, and who desired to leave the parish priest as little fettered by ecclesiastical superiors or rival orders as he is in Scotland or Switzerland to-day' (p. 175). This passage would leave an ordinary reader—and Mr. Workman's book is not written for experts—with the impression that Wyclif was a Presbyterian before the time; the truth contained in it needs much more careful statement. Authority being necessary, and the papal, by the Schism, having annulled itself, Wyclif found the seat of authority in 'God's law' and in its example and precepts of Christian living. The true 'limbs of Christ' were all, whether priests or laymen, who strove to 'kunne and kepe Goddis lawe'; His true priests those who, whether prelates or 'lewd men,' strove to keep it themselves and to 'preach it freely to other after their power.' In an hierarchy constituted with such an end, the most essential element would necessarily be the faithful parish priest; and that not because of any peculiar virtue in his degree of order, but because of the direct ministry of teaching and example which it entailed. As to Wyclif's positive views upon the constitution of the Church at large, we are not aware that he had any programme. His immediate aim was to restore the standard of Christian living, and, as a means thereto, to vindicate the right of simple priests—priests, that is, who shared his views of priestly duty—to go forth among the people with 'God's law' in their hands, undeterred by the inhibition of a 'Cæsarean' prelate. In his 'symple prestis' simpleness meant, not only a russet gown, but all that was opposed to the prevailing Cæsareanism in the ministration of the things of God. It was not against prelates and religious that Wycliffism inveighed, but against 'worldly prelates' and false religious. Wyclif looked for salvation to the priestly order; a reformer had no plank to cling to but the priestly order after the prelate had foundered in the person of its chief. Yet to speak of him as becoming 'a Presbyterian reformer' with 'a new idea of the Church' is to suggest associations which are foreign to the era. It is loose suggestions of this kind which have made Wyclif's name the shuttlecock of parties. There is so much truth in them that they are fatally misleading. We are persuaded that the writer, whose historical instinct is generally so sure, will see that it is precisely a matter of this kind which calls for the nerve and patience of the historian.

ith. Her
common
e must be
ry has too
her servile
her work
does little

Wyclif's
fortunate.
t he had
sbyterian
fault, and
esiastical
d to-day'
and Mr.
ssion that
ained in
ecessary,
lif found
precepts
whether
s lawe';
strove to
ter their
he most
priest;
of order,
which it
on of the
ne. His
ing, and,
—priests,
mong the
hibition
s meant,
revailing
was not
t against
salvation
but the
on of its
eformer'
hich are
ch have
so much
ersuaded
will see
erve and

Mr. Workman gives a sufficient account of the singular discussion which has arisen of late as to the authorship of the Wycliffite versions of the Bible. We think he will prove to have been a little rash in 'rejecting' the view of the editors of those versions, to the effect that 'from the first the most active and powerful measures were taken to suppress them.' He is a bold man who attempts to go behind the work of Messrs. Forshall and Madden. The manuscripts survive and tell their own story.

We are glad to see that Mr. Workman, in the account in his concluding pages of the decline and fall of Wycliffism, dismisses as in his opinion 'an unfortunate historical blunder' the idea that the followers of Wyclif were 'the levellers of the Middle Ages, half fanatics, half communists.' It would be interesting to disentangle the elements which are involved in this misconception. Such it certainly is. It would be strange indeed if men professing principles subversive of civil order should have been found in alliance with a political party, and appealing, as the Wycliffites constantly did, to the intervention of the civil power.

This is, if we may say so, a most encouraging book. It treats of the decadent Church of the later Middle Ages; it is written by a modern Nonconformist minister; it has no pretension; and it is excellent.

Fénelon: his Friends and his Enemies, 1651-1715. By E. K. SANDERS.
(London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1901.)

THE first question which most people will probably ask on reading this deeply interesting book is, 'Who is E. K. Sanders?' This is a question which we are totally unable to answer. E. K. Sanders may be a lady or may be a gentleman; and, if the latter, may be a layman or may be a clergyman—though the name does not occur in Crockford. The book appears without Preface, Introduction, or Dedication, and there is nothing in its contents to furnish a clue to the identity of the author. A few slight touches lead us to conjecture—though the inference may be quite wrong—that it is the product of a lady's pen; and, as it is highly inconvenient to a reviewer to be debarred the use of the personal and possessive pronouns, we shall venture, with humble apologies if it be wrong, to adopt their feminine forms; and if it may be presumed that this is *her* (?) first appearance in the field of literature, we would give her a hearty welcome, and predict for her a successful career. The *subject* of the book is well worthy of the attention of English readers; the *tone* is admirable; the *style* pure, vigorous, and robust; and the estimate taken of the various characters eminently fair and judicial. The writer is no indiscriminate admirer of the great archbishop; indeed, if she errs at all, it is in the opposite direction, especially in the opening pages, which, to speak frankly, rather prejudiced us against her. But her own work is a sufficient proof that these pages require a little modification. We agree with her that Fénelon did not 'attain perfection. Who ever did? But such terms as 'ambitious,' 'headstrong,' 'jealous,' 'his self-confidence,' 'a little spark of malice'—all of which

occur in the first page—give quite a wrong keynote to the true character of the man, and, to say the least, want qualifying and toning down.

Turning from the writer to the subject of the volume, are we right in thinking that Fénelon does not require to be rehabilitated?—that the verdict of posterity has been in his favour, not in that of his enemies? This was the opinion of a good judge, John Keble, who, in his sorely misjudged but most beautiful *Tract for the Times* No. 89, writes: 'Mysticism is not a *hard* word, having been customarily applied to such writers as Fénelon and William Law, whom all parties have generally agreed to praise and admire.'¹ Hallam, the historian, a man of a singularly different type of mind from Fénelon, speaks with unwonted enthusiasm of 'the characteristic sweetness of Fénelon's disposition,' 'the noble zeal of Fénelon,' 'his object of all the noblest';² and another equally unlikely historian, Lord Macaulay, is quite as enthusiastic in Fénelon's praise.³ E. K. Sanders, therefore, has no need to apologize for her hero. She has simply to record facts which tell their own tale; and when that tale is told in the exquisite language of Fénelon himself—exquisite even in its English, much more in its native dress—it is all the more impressive.

The facts are simply these. François de Fénelon (1651-1715) was of noble birth, and belonged by instinct and education to the *noblesse* as clearly as his rival, Bossuet, belonged to the *bourgeois*. This fact, unimportant in itself, accounts, to our mind, very greatly for the differences between them. His uncle, the Marquis de Fénelon, treated him as a son, and sent him in due time to the College of Saint Sulpice, then under the direction of M. Tronson, an excellent man, who acquired a great influence over him, and did much to the formation of his religious character. In the seminary of Saint Sulpice Fénelon received the tonsure, and worked for some years as a parish priest in connexion with that institution, until at the age of twenty-seven he was appointed by the Archbishop of Paris (De Harlai), at the instigation of King Louis XIV., principal of the *Nouvelles Catholiques*, a sort of college for the instruction and confirmation of Huguenot ladies who were inclined to the Roman faith. He lived with his uncle at St. Germain des Prés, and was there brought into contact with the brilliant circle which surrounded the throne of the Grand Monarch; notably with Bossuet, then at the height of his fame, with whom he formed a friendship mingled with reverential awe. But Fénelon himself soon leapt into fame by writing an able treatise on the invalidity of Huguenot orders. This increased the king's favour towards him, and the result was that, after ten years

¹ *On the Mysticism attributed to the Early Fathers*, published afterwards in a separate volume.

² See *Literature of Europe*, iii. 417, 522, 557.

³ See the essay on *Mirabeau and the French Revolution*. For evidence of the high estimation in which Fénelon was held by Englishmen in the eighteenth century, see Abbey and Overton's *English Church in the Eighteenth Century*, ch. ix., 'Enthusiasm.'

work at the Nouvelles Catholiques, he was appointed to the direction of a mission to convert the heretics of Poitou and Saintonge. But Fénelon's idea of conversion was by argument and love, not by brute force, and his pious soul utterly recoiled from the notorious system of 'dragoonades' which the king employed to effect his purpose. So he gladly returned to his more congenial work at the Nouvelles Catholiques, until he was appointed tutor to the king's grandsons, the eldest of whom, the Duke of Burgundy (then only seven years old), was of course in the direct line of succession to the greatest throne in Europe. It was a post for which Fénelon was admirably adapted, for he always loved children and knew their ways. His personal charm, which attracted all ages and classes to him, was nowhere so conspicuous as in his relation to the young; and at the same time he could rule them absolutely with a firm yet light hand. Bossuet had been tutor to the elder Dauphin, and had taken his duties most conscientiously; but he was not so well fitted for such an office as Fénelon, who at once produced a marvellous change for the better in his most distinguished pupil, and retained a life-long influence over him, which no loss of Court favour could impair. Fénelon held this office for five years. In 1695 he was raised at a bound to the Archbishopric of Cambrai, and he desired to resign his tutorial office; but the king would not hear of it. His rise had been extraordinarily rapid, and was sure to make him enemies, who soon had the opportunity of making their enmity felt. It began to be whispered that he was tainted with heresy, and was defending a noted heretic. The heresy was what was called Quietism; the heretic, the famous Madame Guyon. That this unfortunate lady had, in the fervour of devotion, expressed some wild and untenable views, and that she could not bear the searching, not to say bullying, cross-examination of Bossuet, the foremost theologian of the day, is readily admitted; but with her main theses, divested of their extravagances, Fénelon thoroughly agreed.

'The basis of their opinions,' writes E. K. Sanders, 'was similar: the realization of God's presence; the recognition of His perpetual and complete direction, not only of the external circumstances but of the actual minds of believers, was the stimulus of his daily life. If this were Quietism, then he was as guilty as the visionary herself' (p. 106).

But it was a little more than this: or, at least, it might be more definitely stated. Fénelon maintained strongly the doctrines of an inner light; of mystical union with God; of a pure and disinterested love of God without any thought of self, or even of salvation, intermingled with it; of the passive submission of the human will to the Divine Will, technically but rather absurdly called 'abandonment,' which among other things affected the nature of prayer, making it all to be summed up in one petition, 'Thy Will be done.' And as all this agreed with Madame Guyon's views, his chivalry and his sense of truth, no less than his piety, led him so far to defend a poor defenceless woman who was being cruelly persecuted. To fortify his opinions he wrote a book entitled *L'Explication des Maximes des Saints sur la Vie Intérieure*, which was all the more exasperating

because it was unanswerable ; for he showed clearly that similar views had been held by men who were universally regarded as saints of the Church. But he had to do in the first instance with a man of just that type of mind from which anything like what is vaguely termed mysticism is utterly abhorrent. One is loth to believe that a great and good man like Bossuet was jealous of the extraordinary attractiveness and rapid rise of Fénelon, who a short time before had been infinitely inferior to him in reputation and influence. One would rather hope that, to his intensely practical mind, such lofty, and perhaps dreamy, speculations as those of Fénelon really seemed dangerous. But that Bossuet's whole conduct in this crisis towards Fénelon was, to use the mildest term, peculiarly harsh and vindictive is quite obvious. The king, who combined the utmost strictness in doctrine with the utmost laxity in practice, was only too ready to lend a willing ear to any charge of heresy, and, after a very unsatisfactory conference, Fénelon was banished the Court and required to remain in perpetual exile in his distant diocese. He appealed to Rome, and Rome behaved, as she had so often behaved before to her most faithful children, with great meanness and shiftiness. She could not afford to offend the eldest son of the Church, who was also the most powerful sovereign in Europe ; so, after many exercising and no less than two years' delay, the Pope, though he still called Fénelon *piissimo, santissimo, dottissimo*, issued a Bull declaring his *Maximes des Saints* heretical.

Fénelon submitted absolutely and unreservedly to the Papal judgment, and issued a pastoral letter to his diocese, forbidding his flock to keep in their possession the book over which he had spent a year and a half of labour. His alienation from the Court was completed by the unwarrantable publication, without his knowledge, of his immortal *Télémaque*, written privately for the use of his pupil, in which his ideal monarch is described as being exactly what Louis XIV. was *not*, however much he might pretend to be.

Here Fénelon's public life ends. For the rest of his days he lived in his distant diocese, universally respected and beloved, in spite of Papal Bull, royal displeasure, and episcopal malevolence, by his simple flock. And well, indeed, he might be ! For he dwelt among them as a true father in God, sympathising with and personally alleviating the wants and sorrows of the poor, exercising a boundless hospitality to other classes, and striving to lead all to a better and higher life. He employed his pen in writing his *Spiritual Letters* and other works in his own inimitable style.

Would he really have been happier or more useful if he had continued to bask in the sunshine of Court favour, and had obtained the cardinal's hat and been ranked among the princes of the Church ? Surely the Court of Louis XIV. was no place for such as Fénelon ; for its religion was a hollow sham, and its impurity only too true a reality ; and its head was one with whom he could never have had any real sympathy. Louis and his Court seem to us to have been even worse than his English contemporary, Charles II., and his Court. Thackeray, with his usual insight, hits exactly one of the

points of difference between the two monarchs: 'Charles II. was a rogue, but not a snob; whilst Louis XIV., his old square-toes of a contemporary—the great worshipper of Bigwiggery—has always struck me as a most undoubted and Royal Snob.'¹ The volume before us lays rather too much stress on Fénelon's 'downfall,' 'his disgrace,' 'his banishment,' 'his exile,' expressions which occur perpetually. But his reputation he never lost. All good men who know anything about him revere the memory of Fénelon; and perhaps we may fitly conclude this notice with the simple tribute of one of them, which is more touching than better poetry:

'The love of God with genuine ray
Inflam'd the breast of good Cambray,
And banish'd from the prelate's mind
All thoughts of interested kind;
He saw, and writers of his class
(Of too neglected worth, alas!)
Disinterested love to be
The Gospel's very A B C.'²

Religious Writers of England. By the Rev. P. M'ADAM MUIR, D.D.
(London and Edinburgh: A. and C. Black, 1901.)

PERSONAL preference and limits of space have dictated the selection of names in these very interesting sketches. Of course each reader will find some names and miss others, which may lead him to accuse Dr. Muir of arbitrary choice, but on the whole the book justifies its author's claim as being 'fairly representative of different phases of belief and life which have appeared in successive epochs of English Christianity' down to, but excluding, the Victorian era. Caedmon, Bede and Alfred each find a place, as representing early times, in Dr. Muir's list. The slight notices of these writers might well have been somewhat amplified, and we should have welcomed some description of the extremely beautiful monument which has been raised to the memory of Caedmon on the abbey hill at Whitby, an allusion to such further stores of learning as are contained in Dr. Plummer's edition of Bede, and some attempt to direct the reader to the copious Alfred literature which the millenary commemoration scheme called forth. Dr. Muir thinks that Chaucer can hardly be ranked among the distinctively religious writers of England, and he selects Wycliffe and Langland as expressing respectively the voice of the university and of the people in the fourteenth century. We must excuse in a book of these small dimensions the considerable gap between the time of Alfred and of these last-named writers. From the poetry of Lydgate and the prose of Peacock Dr. Muir passes to Fisher, More, Tyndale and Latimer, and his accounts of them combine literary and biographical details in a pleasing narrative. In the seventh and eighth chapters he reaches 'the marvellous beauty and majestic calm' of Hooker's great work, the sermons and devotions of Bishop Andrewes, and the writings of Dr. Donne. A chapter on Bishop Hall can hardly be called quite satisfactory which makes no

¹ *The Book of Snobs*, ch. ii.

² *Poems of John Byrom*, 'On the Disinterested Love of God.'

mention of *The Balm of Gilead*, and when his acceptance of the rectory of Halsted was recorded, a word should have been added to distinguish this Halsted in Kent from the town of the same name in Essex. The poems of George Herbert and the splendid prose of Jeremy Taylor are each the subject of a chapter, and in the following chapters Baxter, Bunyan, and George Fox are chosen as examples of quite a different kind of piety. The chapter on Richard Sibbes, Quarles, John Hales, and Chillingworth concludes with some account of three works which have all derived their title from an expansion of 'the duty of man.' Some great and small names are grouped together in the next group—John Howe, John Owen, South, John Scott, Sir Thomas Browne and Vaughan. An account of the *Spectator*, of Watts and of Doddridge, brings us again to three great names, Butler, Law, and Wesley. Dr. Muir is somewhat too much inclined to lay stress on the irrelevancy of the argument of the *Analogy* in present controversies, but he helps the reader to admire the great bishop—great as a theologian, great as an apologist, great as a thinker, and greatest of all, as a man. There are some aspects of Law's teaching which do not attract such notice from Dr. Muir as they deserve and require, and both Churchmen and Wesleyans will probably think that much is left to be desired in the necessarily brief account of Wesley. The survey concludes with two chapters on Whitefield, Newton, Cowper, James Hervey, and Thomas Scott. We are pleased with the collection of names in the book as a whole, but one question we must ask. Where is the notice of George Crabbe, whom, as Dr. Muir no doubt remembers, the great Sir Walter thought fit to quote in *The Heart of Midlothian*?

BOOKS RECEIVED.

The Life of the Master. By JOHN WATSON, D.D., with sixteen illustrations by CORWIN KNAPP LINSON (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 25s.). This is a beautifully printed, beautifully illustrated book. It will to many be a very attractive present to give at Christmas or other times, especially among those who admire the theological writings of 'Ian Maclaren.' We are not quite certain that the style or method is one that pleases us very much, but to many, we do not doubt, the modern method of putting things will be attractive and perhaps helpful.

The English Theological Library. General Editor, FREDERIC RELTON, A.K.C. With General Introduction by MANDELL CREIGHTON, sometime Lord Bishop of London. *A Relation of the Conference between William Laud, late Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, and Mr. Fisher, the Jesuit.* A new edition with introduction and notes by C. H. SIMPKINSON, M.A., Balliol College, Oxford. (London: Macmillan and Co., 8s. 6d.) An excellent edition of a book which is a landmark in English controversial Theology.

Preparatio, or Notes of Preparation for Holy Communion. Founded on the Collect, Epistle, and Gospel for every Sunday in the year. With Preface by the Rev. GEORGE CONGREVE, M.A., of

the Society of St. John the Evangelist, Cowley. (London : Longmans, Green and Co., 6s.)

The Fatal Opulence of Bishops. By HUBERT HANDLEY, M.A. (London : Adam and Charles Black, 1s.) A cheap reprint.

Examinations in Religious Instructions. By Rev. C. W. FOSTER, M.A. (Grimsby : Roberts and Jackson.)

Christianity and Judaism. By GUSTAV H. DALMAN. Translated from the German by the Rev. G. H. BOX, M.A., Hebrew Teacher at Merchant Taylors' School. (London : Williams and Norgate.)

The Canonists and the Crisis. By ATHANASIUS. (London : Thomas Baker.)

Behold a Sower. A Popular Illustrated Report of the British and Foreign Bible Society, 1900-1901.

On the Love of God, by ST. FRANCIS DE SALES, with Notes and Introduction by W. J. KNOX LITTLE, M.A., and *Thoughts of Pascal*, translated and edited by C. S. JERRAM, M.A., both belonging to the delightful collection of Books of Devotion published by Methuen and Co., of which we have already noted other numbers.

On Bishop Westcott. A sermon preached in Durham Cathedral on Sunday, November 3, 1901, by the Rev. A. S. FARRAR, D.D., Canon of Durham, Professor of Divinity in the University of Durham. An estimate of Bishop Westcott by one well qualified to speak of his intellectual position and literary work.

A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Argyle and the Isles. By J. R. ALEX. CHINNERY-HALDANE, D.D. (Edinburgh : St. Giles Printing Company.)

An Examination of Harnack's 'What is Christianity?' A paper read before the Tutors' Association on October 14, 1901, by W. SANDAY, D.D., LL.D., Lady Margaret Professor, and Canon of Christ Church. (London : Longmans, Green and Co., 1s.) A very valuable paper, to which we hope to refer again later.

A Commemoration of K. Edward the Confessor. A sermon preached in Westminster Abbey on the Festival of his Translation. By J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON, D.D. (London : Macmillan and Co., 6d.)

Stanley's Life of Thomas Arnold, D.D., Headmaster of Rugby. Teachers' Edition, with a Preface by Sir JOSHUA FITCH. (London : John Murray. 6s.) A useful reprint of the life of one who may be fitly described as a great prophet among schoolmasters.

In Memoriam, by Alfred Tennyson, with a Commentary by L. MOREL, LL.D. (2s. 6d.) An edition which would be delightful if there were no commentary. Uniform with this is *Isopel Berners*, by GEORGE BORROW. The text, edited with introduction and notes, by THOMAS SECCOMBE. (London : Hodder and Stoughton.)

The Olde Irishe Rimes of Brian O'Linn, illustrated by S. ROSAMOND PRAGER (2s. 6d.), and *Old King Cole's Book of Nursery Rhymes* (6s.); both beautiful gift books for children. (Macmillan and Co.)

The Boys' Odyssey. By C. PERRY. (Macmillan.) Stories from Homer are sure to be popular, especially with boys.

'Mary and the Wood-Pigeons,' by Mrs. MOLESWORTH (Macmillan), is a charming little fairy-story.

Edward the Exile, by MARY M. DAVIDSON (Hodder and Stoughton), is an historical romance in which history predominates; the wanderings of the exile, Edward, the son of Edmund Ironsides, serving to introduce minute and often striking descriptions of various European courts, towns, monasteries, manuscripts, &c.

The World and Winstow. By EDITH HENRIETTA FOWLER. (Hodder and Stoughton.) The principal characters are well drawn, and among the lesser there are various clever and amusing types. The sketches of children though slight are especially charming.

The Westminster Biographies: John Henry Cardinal Newman. By A. R. WALLER and G. H. S. BURROW. (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, and Co., Ltd.)

Handbooks for Bible Classes. Edited by Professor MARCUS DODS, D.D., and Rev. ALEXANDER WHYTE. *The Pastoral Epistles*. A new translation. With introduction etc. by Rev. J. P. LILLEY, M.A., Arbroath. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.)

From the S. P. C. K.

In the Days of St. Anselm, by GERTRUDE HOLLIS, gives an excellent picture of the time, and is well worth reading.

In *One Woman's Work* the character of the heroine, whose courage no adversity can daunt, is well drawn. A somewhat similar type is Patience Bernard in *A Girl's Resolve*, though in this case the difficulties are not brought into prominence.

Ethel Hardman is the story of a successful singer, and deals with rather more complex characters.

In Luck's Way, by C. MALLANDAINE, brings out strikingly the serious consequences which may result from a single act of deception.

Kitty, by ADELA FRANCES MOUNT, describes with a certain pathos the hard life of a motherless child with a reprobate father, whom she finally reforms.

From Playground to Battle Field. By FREDERICK HARRISON. The latter part of the story, in which the two schoolboys serve as soldiers under Wellington, is exciting and well told. *Little John Cope* is another boy's book.

Church Facts and Festivals. Short papers for young children.

The Churchman's Remembrancer. We notice that the Rev. W. A. Fearon is described as headmaster of Winchester, although he resigned last Easter, and that no headmaster of Westminster is mentioned, although Dr. Gow has been appointed more than six months. We hope that the remainder of the information is of a different character.

The Dawn of Day. This is an excellent parish magazine.

Little Citizens. Written and illustrated by EDITH FARMILOE.

Wise Saws and Modern Instances. By MARY E. BELLAIRS.

Golden Sunbeams. Vol. V.

The Children's Pictorial Natural History. Pictured by CATON MOORE PARK.

The Soul's Daily Audience of God. By Rev. E. L. CUTTS.

We have also received a very ample and varied series of Calendars and Almanacks, especially various editions of the *Churchman's Almanack*, the merits of which are well known.

From Skeffington & Son.

Catechisings for the Church and Sunday Schools on our Saviour's Work. By the Rev. J. HASLOCH POTTER and the Rev. A. E. W. SHEARD.

The Second Advent and Prayer. By a PARISH PRIEST. 1s.

Thirsting for the Living Waters, and other Sermons. By the late ROBERT TRIMMER, formerly Hon. Canon of Winchester, and Rector of Holy Trinity and St. Mary's, Guildford. 2s. 6d.

The Protestantism of the Reformed and Catholic Church in England, and The Catholicity of the Reformed Church of England. By ARTHUR GALTON.

Eighty Outline Lessons on the Church Catechism. By the late Rev. HENRY STEWART, with Preface by GEORGE BODV, D.D., Canon Missioner of the Diocese of Durham.

From Mowbray & Co. (Oxford and London.)

The Story of the Promise. By the Rev. CHARLES C. BELL.

Peace, Perfect Peace. A Few Messages of Comfort from various Sources. Selected by ELIZABETH SNUSHALL.

The Brechin Case. The theological defence of the Bishop of Brechin, before the Episcopal Synod of 1860. Edited and abridged by J. COMPER, one of his former Presbyters.

The Practical Religion. By the Rev. VERNON STALEY. (3rd ed.). 1s.

Why I am a Churchman: an Apologia pro Vita mea. By JOSEPH HAMMOND, LL.B., Vicar of St. Austell and Canon of Truro. A series of papers by a well-known writer, reprinted from the *National Church*. They contain the arguments which influenced him in joining the Church, and are likely to be very useful in many places.

From Home Words publishing office.

Hand and Heart. Illustrated Tales Volume for 1901. Edited by H. SOMERSET BULLOCK, 2s.

The Fireside. Pictorial Annual, 1901. Conducted by the Rev. CHARLES BULLOCK, B.D., 7s. 6d.

The Day of Days Annual. Vol. XXX. Edited by CHARLES BULLOCK, 2s.

Home Words. Conducted by Rev. CHARLES BULLOCK, B.D. Formerly Rector of St. Nicholas, Worcester.

From the Church of England Sunday School Institute.

The Church Worker. Vol. XX. 1901.

The Boys' and Girls' Companion. Also *An Address to Sunday School Teachers*, by the Rev. Canon HENSLEY HENSON; and other tracts. *The Child and the Prayer-Book.* By JOHN DICKENSON, B.A. *Bible Scenes and Pictures.* By the Rev. ROBERT R. RESKER. This seems to be a very good course of Sunday School Lessons.

REVIEWS AND MAGAZINES.

The Indian Church Review has some interesting papers, especially 'Modern Hindu Reforms,' by the Rev. C. E. Gardner, S.S.J.E., and 'An Eucharistic Eirenicon,' by the Rev. W. R. Carson (from a liberal Roman Catholic standpoint). There are also articles on 'The Training of the Missionary,' by the Principal of Dorchester, and 'Missionary Problems in East Africa,' by the Venerable Archdeacon of Magila, and 'Some Ancient Ordination Ceremonies,' by the Rev. W. K. Firminger.

The Journal of Theological Studies (October 1901) is full of interest to the scholar. The longer articles are 'Further Remarks on the History of the Creed,' by the Rev. W. Sanday. 'The History of the Theological Term "Substance," Part II.,' by the Dean of Christ Church. 'The Clementine Literature,' by the Rev. A. C. Headlam. 'The Syriac text of the Apostolic Church Order,' by the Rev. L. P. Arendzen, and a note on *πάρωντος* and *πῆρωντος*, by the Rev. J. Armitage Robinson.

By far the most interesting articles in the *Jewish Quarterly Review* (October 1901) are the contributions of the editor, Mr. C. G. Montefiore. He discusses 'The Desire for Immortality,' and reviews Krauskopf, 'Rabbi's Impressions of the Ober-Ammergau Passion Play,' and Loisy, 'Études Bibliques' and 'La Religion d'Israël.' These discussions of Christian doctrines by a liberal and able Jew are full of interest. The remaining contributions are chiefly details in Jewish history.

The Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift is the organ of German orthodoxy and is largely devoted to Lutheran history and theology. The September number begins 'Entwicklung und Bedeutung der Sakramentslehre Luther,' von Pastor Karl Thimme. The October number, 'Luthers Stellung zu den sittlichen und sozialen Nöten seiner Zeit und ihre vorbildete Bedeutung für die Evangelische Kirche,' von Prof. D. R. Seeberg in Berlin. The December number contains an article on 'Die Messianische Erwartung in den alttestamentlichen Apokryphen,' von Pfarrer Couard in Klinkow.

In the *Dublin Review* (October 1901) there is a review of 'Canon Gore on the Eucharist,' by the Very Rev. H. I. D. Ryder.

The Expositor (November 1901). The most interesting article is probably an able review of 'Professor Harnack on our Lord's Resurrection' by the Rev. Samuel McComb. Professor Ramsay has an article called 'Corroboration,' in which he speaks with his usual scorn of those who disagree with him. Other articles are 'Cyrus, the Lord's Anointed,' by the Rev. Arthur Carr; a further note on the use of Enoch in 1 Peter, by Professor J. Rendel Harris; and 'Notes on Select Passages in the Old Testament' from papers by Dr. Field, the well-known editor of the *Hexapla*. In the December number Professor Ramsay is interesting on 'The Cities of the Pauline Churches,' and the Rev. George Milligan writes on the 'Roman Destination of the Epistle to the Hebrews.'

Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique, October 1901 (Université Catholique de Louvain). A. Van Hoonacker, 'L'hypothèse de M. Wendt

sur la composition du quatrième évangile'; C. Callewaert, 'Les premiers chrétiens furent-ils persécutés par édits généraux ou par mesures de police?' F. X. Funk, 'La date de la Didascalie des Apôtres.' Among the reviews is one of a translation of Mr. W. Ward's *Life of Cardinal Wiseman*.

Revue de L'Orient Chrétien (1901, No. 3). S. Vailhé, 'Saint Michel le Syncelle et les deux Frères Grapti; Grieffs de l'Hellénisme contre la Russie'; Dom P. Renaudin, 'Les Églises Orientales et Orthodoxes et le Protestantisme'; V. Ermoni, 'Rituel copte du Baptême et du Mariage'; and other papers. It is the principal organ of the Roman Church in relation to Eastern Christianity.

Revue Biblique Internationale, October 1901. (The organ of the School of Biblical Studies established at the Dominican Monastery of St. Stephen in Jerusalem.) Pont, 'Le nom divin est-il intensif en hébreu?' Th. Calmes, 'Études sur le prologue du quatrième évangile.' Lagrange, 'L'Inscription de Méra, Études sur les religions sémitiques.' There are some inscriptions and other archæological notes. The archæological work of the convent of St. Stephen is probably the most efficient in Jerusalem.

The Presbyterian and Reformed Review, October 1901. (Philadelphia.) 'English Theistic Thought at the close of the Century' (Benjamin L. Hobson), 'Psychology as a Natural Science' (Edward N. Griffin), 'James Martineau' (Frank H. Foster), are the principal articles. The interest of the Review is mainly philosophical.

In the *Critical Review* the most interesting notice is that of Professor Moberly's 'Atonement and Personality.' 'Canon Moberly has given to the world a book which is far above the level even of the best theology. It can only be described as the most impressive English contribution to strictly dogmatic literature made during the last ten or twenty years. Its range and penetration are of the greater order.'

In the *Classical Review* for October is a review of Swete's 'Introduction to the LXX', by E. H. Blakeney; in that for November 'Blass's Gospel of St. Matthew,' by F. C. Burkitt.

The *Expository Times* suffers from the very sketchy character of most of its articles, but it is always fully up to date. The most interesting contribution to the November number is Mrs. Lewis's account of a palimpsest she has deciphered. It contains among other matter a leaf of the Septuagint with variants from the Hexapla.

The *Edinburgh Review* for October contains an article on 'Rome and the Novelists,' describing the different ways in which Roman Catholicism is treated by several well-known novelists. Reasons for the frequent choice of the subject are suggested. 'Magic and Religion' gives a summary of Andrew Lang's attack in *Magic and Religion* upon Frazer's facts and theories in the *Golden Bough*. The article begins with the assumption that the history of religion need not deal with the truth of religion. It is written in a fair spirit, and inclines in favour of Andrew Lang's views.

The 'Notes and Memoranda' of the *Economic Review* include a few paragraphs on the Pope's view of Social and Christian Demo-

cracy. The Rev. C. Fry has contributed an admirable sketch of Bishop Westcott, considering his work in connexion with social reform.

The life of the same Bishop, from a scholastic standpoint, is ably treated by the Rev. J. O. F. Murray, in the *Contemporary Review* for October. 'The Intellectual Strength of the Low-Church Position,' by C. J. Shebbeare, which appeared in the same number, challenges the fundamental doctrines of the Catholic faith, viz. the belief in the Sacraments. The writer ignores the undoubted attitude of the Apostles and those most nearly contemporary with the institution of the Holy Communion with regard to the Sacrament of the altar. The *Contemporary Review* (November) has an exhaustive analysis of Protestantism in France, emphasizing the curious fact that while the attendance in Protestant churches has declined, a Protestant tone of thought is more than ever prevalent.

The *Contemporary Review* (December). Canon Hensley Henson has written a striking article, 'A Plea for the Recognition of Non-Episcopal Churches.' To this subject we shall probably recur later. The Rev. W. W. Peyton is again discussing his old theme under the title of 'Anthropology Reconstructed.'

The *Quarterly Review* (October) gives a life of the Empress Frederick, in which stress is laid on the strong religious undercurrent which constituted the strength of her character. A sketch of Charlotte M. Yonge shows us a distinct and pleasing picture of the authoress.

The *English Historical Review*. E. R. Bevan contributes an article on 'The Deification of Kings in Greek Cities.'

The *Monthly Review* (November). The Editor has produced some remarkable extracts from the writings of the late Amir of Afghanistan, showing the character of the Moslem religion as held by the Afghans.

The *Catholic World* (November). In 'An Episcopal Bid for Reunion,' T. W. Brathewaite speaks with scathing sarcasm of the elastic views of American and English 'Episcopalians' in contrast with the unity in the Roman Church. When, however, he assures us that 'there is no tendency to stampede from Papal authority, even by the smallest aggregation among the hundred of millions of Catholics,' we are inclined to receive his statements with caution. The Rev. Lucian Johnston, in an amusing and interesting article, describes 'The Art of Preaching in Mediæval Times,' dealing in the December number with 'Preaching during the Renaissance.' An article on Mr. Goldwin Smith's 'Guesses at the Riddle of Existence,' by Walter Sweetman, also appears in this number. The writer scorns the theory of Evolution. The Creator he regards as the Supreme Artist, needing no lengthy process to produce His work of art. The cruelty of nature is touched upon, but no ray of light is thrown on the problem.

The *Review of Reviews* for December contains a characteristic 'character sketch' of the Bishop-elect of Worcester.

INDEX TO VOL. LIII.

ACC

ACCESION Service, the new form of the, 489
 Acts of the Apostles, Criticism and the, 1 *sqg.*: right attitude towards criticism, 2; function of criticism, 3; definition, 4; what is demanded of a critic, 5; recent criticism of Acts of the Apostles: textual problems, 6; results, 7; the author of Acts: Professor Schmiedel's views (*Encyc. Bibl.*), 8; the 'we' sections, 10; alleged discrepancies between Acts and Ep. to Galatians: St. Paul's visit to Jerusalem, 11; its object and results, 12; alleged antagonism of Jewish and Gentile Christianity, 13; positive arguments as to author of Acts: unity of style of the whole work, 15; he was probably a Gentile Christian, 17; date of the work: views of Harnack and Schmiedel, 18; arguments from the author's apparent lack of acquaintance with St. Paul's Epistles, 19; his undeveloped theological language, *ib.*; absence of reference to monarchical episcopacy, 20; the Lucan or early authorship accepted by Renan, Ramsay, Blass, Harnack, 21
 Adams, Rev. D. C. O., *The Saints and Missionaries of the Anglo-Saxon Era*, 240
 Alfred Literature and Commemoration, the, 139 *sqg.*: samples of glowing eulogies of Alfred by learned men, 140; authorities for our information about him: the Saxon Chronicle, 144; Asser's *Life of Alfred*, 146; later and modern writers on Alfred, 147; Dr. Pauli's *Life*, 148; Guizot,

CAR

Thomas Hughes, 149; contemporary literature: Mr. Bowker's *Alfred the Great*, 150; Alfred's love for Rome, 151; his relation to religious affairs, 152; his career as a warrior, *ib.*; geographer and legislator, 153; recent Lives, sermons, lectures, speeches, 154; sketch of Alfred's life, 155; his mysterious malady, 156; code of laws, 157; his alleged foundation of Oxford, *ib.*; his character, 158; date of his death, 159; Dean Church's estimate of him, *ib.*

BANKS, Professor J. S., *The Development of Doctrine, &c.*, 492
 Best, Rev. K. D., *The Victories of Rome and the Temporal Monarchy of the Church*, 235
 Bigg, Rev. Dr. C., *The Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude*, 469
 Books received, Notes on, 254, 502
 Bradley, Prof. A. C., *A Commentary on Tennyson's 'In Memoriam'*, 231
 Burkitt, Mr. F. C., *Two Lectures on the Gospels*, 476
 Bute, Marquess of, and Budge, Dr. E. A. W., *The Blessing of the Waters on the Eve of the Epiphany*, 484

CALDECOTT, Prof. A., *The Philosophy of Religion in England and America*, 241
 Capetown, Archbishop of, *Order for Special Services . . . for the Day of the Coronation of . . . Edward VII.*, 490
 Carter, Canon, of Clewer, 416 *sqg.*: sanctity under the aspect of

CHR

beauty, 417; brightness the dominant note of his character, *ib.*; friendship with Bishop Armstrong, 418; the Penitentiary Work at Clewer, *ib.*; its growth and extension: Harriet Monsell, 419; Canon Carter's early life, and work as a parish priest, 420; great labours as a spiritual guide, 421; his teaching on confession, 422; reputed as a preacher, 423; as a conductor of Retreats, 424; effort to restore the 'Religious Life,' 425; gentleness and courage in controversies, 426; his resignation of Rectory of Clewer, 427; his view of the Ritual question, 427 *sq.*; of the rubrics: reservation for the sick, 428; treatment of Dissenters, 429; of Disestablishment, 430; posture towards Church of Rome, *ib.*; love of Holy Scripture, *ib.*; the legacy of spiritual teaching he has left, 431; a noble example of a life of devotion, 432

Christianity and Humanism (review of Mr. H. Black's *Culture and Restraint*), 376 *sqq.*: the true relation of the Church to the World, 376; the Early Christian treatment of them as antithetic, 377; Mr. Black's treatment of the two ways of life: self-realization (Culture), self-sacrifice (Restraint), 378; the fundamental question arising out of this contrast, 379; the conflicting ideals identified in the Hellenic and Hebrew temperaments, 380; illustrations of the contrast, 381; the question left undecided by the contrast, 382; statement of the distinction between mere Humanism and Self-realization: two forms of Humanism, *ib.*; there is unceasing conflict between the lower Humanism and Christianity, 383; Mr. Black neglects the higher ethic of Humanism, 384; our duty is to realize the *rational* self, 385; Mr. Black's contrasted ideal of Restraint: the ascetic scheme,

COR

386; his eulogy of the Golden Age of Monasticism, *ib.*; his criticism of the ascetic ideal, 387; where mortification is necessary, it must never be for its own sake, 388; a definition of self-realization, 390; restraint needed even in the attainment of culture, *ib.*; Bosanquet, T. H. Green, Mackenzie, and Muirhead's views on self-sacrifice, 391; it often indicates the transition from individual to social good, *ib.*; the conciliation of the conflict, 392; Mr. Black's account of the 'Christian solution,' 394; the Christian consciousness of God, 395; how the ideals of Culture and Restraint are unified by the Christian conception of life and of love, 396 *sqq.*

Coronations, English, 257 *sqq.*: archaic derivation of some of the ceremonies, 258; the election of the king and the elevation on the shield, *ib.*; the procession from the palace to the church, 259; periods of the history of the coronation service: the Latin orders, *ib.*; history of the service, 260; its resemblance to the consecration of a bishop, 261; details of the first order known, *ib.*; the king's oath, 262; the second order, 263; consecration of the Queen Consort, 264; this order the basis of that used in France and Italy, *ib.*; the third order: details of coronation of Richard I., 265; curious episode of the oath, 266; the crowning and enthronement, 267; comparison of some details with modern forms, *ib.*; the episcopal vestments with which the king is adorned, 268; the acclamations, 269; the coronation of Queen Eleanor of Provence, *ib.*; a new element in the third order, 270; the new order used at coronation of Edward II. and after (*translated* in 1603), 271; details of its rites, 272; new features, 273; the oath, 274; the consecration and

CRA

unction, *ib.*; the chrism: history of its use, 275; investiture with the symbols of royalty, 276; the queen's coronation, 277; the communion, 278; Westminster the crowning place, 279; the swords: *Curlana*, *ib.*; St. Edward's staff, *ib.*

Crawford, Mr. W. S., *Synesius the Hellene*, 205

Crozier, Dr. J. B., *History of Intellectual Development on the Lines of Modern Evolution* (vol. iii.), 247

DANIEL, Rev. Canon, *The Prayer Book*, 483

Duckworth, Rev. H. T. F., *Greek Manuals of Church Doctrine*, 225

EDUCATION in Parliament, 160 *sqq.*: need of a coherent national system, 161; present Government best fitted to provide it, *ib.*; Sir John Gorst's apparent apathy, 162; the Government's half-hearted policy, 163; the urgency of systematic organization, 165; benefits of the new method of legislation, 166; centralization of authority, 167; suggestions as to the coming Bill, 168; what is meant by a really national system, 169; treatment of vested interests, *ib.*; principle of Bill must be local option, 170; position of denominational schools, 171; practical measures: suggestions of Salisbury Diocesan Conference, 172; of Joint Conference of the Convocations, 173; selection of teachers: Sir W. Anson's proposal, 174; educational aspect of the question, 175; need of co-ordination of our school systems, 176; the lesser secondary schools, 177; prevention of waste and over-lapping, 178; suitable local authorities for each system, 179; suggested education committees of County Councils, 180; special provision for London, 181

FOU

Education, The Church and, 456 *sqq.*: the plea for efficiency: the laxness of Government, 457; the Convocation resolutions almost ignored, 458; action by some Diocesan Conferences, 459; what should be the principles of a Church policy, 460; the scheme proposed: a single educational authority, *ib.*; what that authority should be, 461; equal treatment for all elementary schools, 462; why the voluntary system must be given up, 463; not complete equality asked for, *ib.*; the share in the management of its schools the Church must give, 464; objections to this considered, 465; the protection of minorities, 466; forecast of prospects of the scheme, 467 *sq.*

FOUCHÉ (review of M. Madelin's work), 351 *sqq.*: recent literature about the French Revolution, 351; Fouché's early life: with the Oratorians, 352; relations with Robespierre, *ib.*; treatment of slave emancipation, 353; member of Legislative Assembly, *ib.*; vacillation on public education, 354; adoption of terrorism and its extreme measures, 355; the protagonist of atheism, and apostle of the Commune, 356; promoter of the horrors at Lyons, 357; the holocaust of victims, 358; a *volte-face*: the struggle between Fouché and Robespierre, 359; contrast of their characters, 361; the victory and its results, 361 *sq.*; the Directory: Fouché as French envoy, 362; appointed Minister of the General Police, 363; his firmness of action: the Jacobin Club, 364; first meeting with Napoleon: their after relations, 364 *sq.*; Fouché's development of the general police, 365; his policy and unerring tact, 366; dismissal from office, *ib.*; recall (1804), 367; relations with Talleyrand, *ib.*; Fouché made Duc d'Otrante, 368; charge of

FRE

plotting Napoleon's downfall, *ib.*; Fouché's attempt to justify all his past actions, 369; dealings with the clergy, *ib.*; the preparation for Napoleon's divorce, *ib.*; Fouché's secret negotiations with England: dismissed from office and exiled (1810), 370; his life in exile, 372; his return, in 1814, *ib.*; the Hundred Days, 373; Fouché Minister of State to Louis XVIII., 374; M. Made-lin's indictment of Fouché, 374 *sq.*; the final collapse, 375; his end, 376

Frere, Rev. W. H., *Pontifical Services*, 488

GAMBOLD, John, Poet and Moravian Bishop, 65 *sqq.*: antiquity of the Gambold family, 65; John Gambold's birth and early years, 66; he abandons a love for poetry as vain and sinful, *ib.*; intimacy with John and Charles Wesley, 67; his studies and ordination: vicar of Staun-ton-Harcourt, *ib.*; makes the acquaintance of the Moravian Brethren, 68; resigns his living and joins the Moravians, 69; minister at the Fetter Lane Chapel, 70; consecrated a Mora-vian Bishop, 71; literary work: edition of Lord Bacon's works, *ib.*; break-down in health, 72; death, 73; his brilliant scholar-ship, *ib.*; his writings, 74; his drama, *Ignatius*, *ib.*; other poems: 'Religious Discourse,' 75; 'The Corrective,' *ib.*; 'My-stery of Life,' 76; 'Epitaph on Himself,' 77

Glazebrook, Rev. M. G., *Prospice* (Sermons), 213

Grafton, Bishop (Fond du Lac), *The Eucharistic Sacrifice* (Charge), 224; *Fond du Lac Tracts*, No. 2: *The Holy Eu-charist in the New Testament*, 225

Gregory, Eleanor C., *An Intro-duction to Christian Mysticism*, 223

HOL

HECKER, Father, and Ameri-canism (review of his *Life* by Rev. W. Elliott), 22 *sqq.*: Hecker's theory: development of individualism and national-ism within the Roman Church, 23; his birth and early training, 24; a social reformer: joins the Brook Farm community, 25; passage through Mysticism and Spiritualism, 26; his discontent with Protestantism, 27; his ideal socialism and ideal Church, 28 *sq.*; the (American) Anglican communion had no attraction for him, 30; joins the Roman Church, 31; a Redemptorist in Belgium, 32; his method of prayer: ne-glect of the human side, 33; dis-like for the drudgery of study, 34; his ordination (in London), and return to America, 35; his nationalist desires cause his ex-pulsion from the Redemptorists, *ib.*; founds the Paulists: his ideal of the new Society, 36; he accepts the dogma of Papal In-fallibility, 37; prolonged physical sufferings, 38; a strain between authority and the conscience, *ib.*; his death: estimate of his cha-racter, 39; the controversy about his 'Americanism,' 40; the Pope's letter thereon, *ib.*

Herkless, Rev. Dr., *Francis and Dominic and the Mendicant Orders*, 250

Hime, Dr. M., *Schoolboys' Special Immorality*, 215

Holden, Rev. H. W., *Justification by Faith*, 473

Holloway, Rev. H., *The Confirma-tion and Communion of Infants and Young Children*, 490

Holy Eucharist, The: history of the doctrines which have been held concerning it, 92 *sqq.*; the teaching of St. Gregory the Great: the Eucharistic sacrifice a renewal of the Passion, 93; in the Middle Ages: doctrine of St. John of Damascus and Peter Lombard, 94; St. Thomas Aquinas, 95; no accurately de-fined theory of the sacrifice among

HOL

the Schoolmen, 96; they are mainly occupied with the relation of the Presence to the elements, 97; the work of consecration ascribed to God the Holy Ghost, 98; doctrine of the Presence taught by Paschasius Radbert, 99; this teaching challenged by Rabanus Maurus and Ratramn, 100; the controversy with Berengar, 101; Berengar's doctrine opposed by Lanfranc and Witmund, 102; Hildebert's attempt to avoid the more materialistic phraseology, 103; the language of Peter Lombard on the Presence, 105; decree of Fourth Lateran Council on the Eucharist, 106; meaning of the word 'transubstantiation' there used, 107; the doctrine of the Presence stated by St. Thomas Aquinas, *ib.*; the Schoolmen's motives in their treatment of the doctrine, 108; doctrine of the Eastern Church: Theophylact's teaching much the same as that of the patristic period, 434; Euthymius Zigabenus: 'the mystic sacrifice of the Body of the Lord,' 436; Soterichus: the Eucharistic sacrifice was offered to the Father alone, 437; Nicolas of Methone: condemns the view of Soterichus, 438; the Eucharist a sacrifice: the elements are 'transformed by the operation of the Holy Ghost,' *ib.*; Nicolas Cabasilas: teaches 'the change ($\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\theta\omicron\lambda\eta$) of the gifts' in the sacrifice, 439; his explanation of the Liturgical actions, 440; doctrine of the Council of Florence (1439), 441; St. Thomas Aquinas on 'sacrifice,' *ib.*; Alexander of Hales on the consecration in two kinds, 442; the differences between the Thomists and the Scotists, 443; the controversies of the later middle ages, 444; a strange theory: that the sacrifice on Calvary was for original sin, that of the Mass for actual sin, 445; thirteenth century protests against 'transubstantiation,' 446; teaching of

VOL. LIII.—NO. CVI.

LAY

John of Paris, 447; Durandus of St. Pourçain, 448; William of Occam, 448 *sq.*; the doctrine of Wyclif, 450 *sqq.*; John Hus (Bohemia), John Wessel (Germany), 453; doctrine in England (1381-1416) as to the Presence, 455

JACKSON, Prof. G. M., *Huldreich Zwingli, the Reformer of German-Switzerland*, 237

John Wesley's Journal, 314 *sqq.*: the book little known, 314; its interest and naturalness, 315; Wesley's reasons for publishing it, 316; a kind of Apologia for Methodism, 316; its record of his labours, 317; distances covered in his missionary travels, 318; account of a winter journey, 319; his stories of the supernatural: Elizabeth Hobson, 320; ghost stories and clairvoyance, 321; credulous in religious beliefs, Wesley was sceptical and incredulous in other matters, 322; treatment of the narratives of travellers, 323; a severe literary critic, 324; books judged solely by their moral tone, 325; contempt for the country and country life, 326; indifference to literary fame, *ib.*; his observations on Scottish life and customs, 327; Scottish university life, 328; his biting sarcasm, 329; variety of allusions in the Journal, 330

Julian, anchoress at Norwich, Revelations of Divine Love, recorded by (ed. Grace Warrack), 222

KENNEDY, Rev. Dr. J. H., *The Second and Third Epistles of St. Paul to the Corinthians*, 474

Kenyon, F. G., *Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, 480

LANG, Mr. Andrew, *Magic and Religion*, 197.

Lay Franchise, the, 280 *sqq.*: the demand for a system of self-

L L

LIL

government in the Church, 280: question involved: What is the franchise of the Church? 281; original idea of the 'parish': purely ecclesiastical, 282; its officers and the 'parishioners,' 283; duty of 'the parish,' *ib.*; introduction of the 'ratepayer,' 284; anomaly and confusion resulting: the new 'civil' parish, 285; the need to re-create the old 'Church' parish, 286; 'parishioners' defined by Church law: communicants, 287; Councils, Canons, and Scripture on this point, 288; objections to the principle of Corporation and Test Acts, 290; arguments against the 'communicant' franchise, 291; reply to the argument from expediency, 293; solution of the difficulty to be found in *status*—though non-communicant, yet not excommunicate, 295; the 'confirmation test,' 296; the franchise must involve some definite profession of churchmanship, 297; the questions of age, sex, and residence, 299

Lillingston, Rev. F., *The Brahmo Samaj and Arya Samaj in their Bearing upon Christianity*, 204

Liverpool Cathedral Scheme, the, 42 *sqg.*: last century views about our Cathedrals, 43; efforts at reform, 44; the new diocese of Liverpool: inadequacy of its Cathedral, 45; scheme for a new one: difficulties and problems involved, 46; Bishop Ryle's view, 47; controversies and temporary failure, 48; gain by the delay, 49; a fresh start: the choice of a site, *ib.*; question of architecture, 50; arguments for and against Gothic, 51; Mr. Statham's views, 52; Mr. Emerson's design, 53; suggested use of the original design of Wren for St. Paul's, 54; the spiritual uses of the Cathedral, 56; assertion of the unity of the Church as realized in the Bishop's See, 57; the Cathedral as the centre of organization, 58; special diocesan

MYC

duties should be attached to residentiary canonries, 59; a permanent Canon Missioner suggested, 60; a Canonry of Religious Education, 61; theological training of candidates for Holy Orders, *ib.*; the Cathedral as the central House of Praise and Prayer, 63

MEDIAEVAL Frankish Monarchy, The, 300 *sqg.*: its important relations to the history of mediæval Europe, 300; French origins: Cæsar and Romanization, 301; growth and power of Christianity, *ib.*; Clovis and his descendants, the Merwings, 302; influence of feudalism, Roman law, Christian faith and discipline, 303; the rule of Dagobert, *ib.*; the Carlings: Austrasia and Neustria, 304; revival of dignity of 'Roman Emperor,' *ib.*; foundation of modern Kingdom of France, 305; monarchy of the Capets, 306; growth of the hereditary principle, 307; development of feudalism, growth of royal power, 308; the dominance of the Capets helped by Church influence, 309; Suger, Abbat of St. Denys, 310; growth of the communes, 311; Paris: the Marchands de l'Eau, *ib.*; influence of literature, 312; personal influence of the monarchs, 313; St. Louis, *ib.*

Muir, Rev. P. M'Adam, *Religious Writers of England*, 501

Mycenæan Age, The, 331 *sqg.*: recent growth of archæological discoveries: Botta's and Layard's work, 331; extension backwards of Greek history, 332; Schliemann's and Dörpfeld's work: Hissarlik (the true site of Troy), 333; sensational results of Mycenæ, *ib.*; Tiryns and its citadel, 334; other finds in Greece and its islands, 335; discoveries at Phylácopi (Melos) by Mr. C. Smith and Mr. D. G. Hogarth: pottery, frescoes, 336; Mr. A. J. Evans's at Knossos (Crete), 337; the

OLL

palace (of Minos) and its contents: evidences of primitive writing, 338; frescoes with figure subjects, reliefs, miniature designs, 339; architecture, *ib.*; evidence of religious practices: tree worship or pillar worship, 340; the Dictæan cave and Zakro, 341; Mr. H. R. H. Hall's opinions on Mycænæan history (*The Oldest Civilization of Greece*), *ib.*; Professor Ridgeway's *The Early Age of Greece*, 342; the date of Mycænæ, *ib.*; inter-relation of Egyptian and Mycænæan pottery, 343; the founders of Mycænæ: Professor Ridgeway's theory, 344; his arguments criticized, 345; the connexion between the Mycænæan and Homeric civilization, 346; Homer's use of 'iron' and 'bronze,' 347; cremation, 348; criticism of Professor Ridgeway's identification of the Achæans with the Celts, *ib.*; what the recent discoveries have taught us, 350

OLLIVIER, Rev. M. I., *The Passion* (transl. E. Leahy), 226

PEMBER, Mr. G. H., *The Church, the Churches, and the Mysteries*, 234

Pigou, Mr. A. C., *Robert Browning as a Religious Teacher*, 232

REVIEWS and Magazines, Notes on, 255, 506

Roberts, Professor W. Rhys, *Dionysius of Halicarnassus*, 208

SANDERS, E. K., *Fénelon: his Friends and his Enemies*, 497

Séguin, Madame de, *The Letters of*, 77 *sqq.*: the charm of old books, 78; interesting personages in Mme. de Séguin's letters, 79; the secret of her immortality, 80; her gift of happy expression, 81; simplicity and infinite variety, 82; sketch of her life, 83; a temperament that

UNI

makes for happiness, 84; her philosophy and her religion, 85; her maxim 'to make friends,' *ib.*; insatiable love of reading, 86; her favourite, Nicole's *Moral Essays*, 87; her religion, 88; her extensive knowledge of French, Latin, and Italian works, 89; love of Nature, 90; her witty tongue and warm and loyal heart, 91

Smith, Dr. G. Vance, *The Bible and its Theology*, 475

Soames, Rev. W. H. K., *Eating the Bread of Life*, 479

Staley, Rev. V., *Studies in Ceremonial*, 491

TOZER, Rev. H. F., *An English Commentary on Dante's 'Divina Commedia'*, 228

Tyrell, Rev. G., *The Faith of the Millions*, 217

UNITED Free Church of Scotland, the, 109 *sqq.*: an event of happy augury, 110; the divisions of Presbyterianism, 111; the causes thereof: the question of the relation of Church and State, 112; elements that compose the United Free Church: the Secession Church, 113; the United Presbyterians and the Free Church, 114; principles of Scottish Presbyterianism derived from John Knox, 115; the essential feature in the constitution of Knox's Church, 116; the seat of authority, the Christian people, 117; the executive: Kirk Session, Synod, General Assembly, 118; absence of the Presbytery, *ib.*; the contest with the Stewart kings: the King *versus* a free General Assembly, 119; the Concordat of Leith, *ib.*; Bishops in General Assemblies, 120; action of James VI. and its results, 121; position of the Free Church protesters against the recent Union, 122; the Scottish Reformation principle that the Church is co-extensive with the State, 123; effects of the Revo-

WAG

lution Settlement, 124; policy of William III., 125; Parliamentary dealing with patronage of livings, 126; general effect of the Acts of William III. and Anne, 127; struggles between the lairds and the Kirk, 128; the system of teinds, 129; the 'outed' ministers of 1661, 130; religious apathy, 131; the 'Marrow controversy' and its results, 132; Ebenezer Erskine, Thomas Gillespie: the question of patronage, 133; beginnings of the United Presbyterian Church, 134; the Disruption, *ib.*; birth of the Free Church, 135; forecast of hoped-for results of the recent Union, 136; signs of tendencies towards a further union, 137

WAGGETT, Rev. P. N., *The Age of Decision* (Sermons),

211

Wandering Scholar, A, of the Renaissance (review of Mr. F. M. Nichols's *The Epistles of Erasmus*), 399 *sqq.*: contents and object of the work, 400; Erasmus's early love of letter-writing: his *De Conscribendis Epistolis*, 401; the *Farrago Epistolarum*, *ib.*; the chronology of the letters: difficulties arising from omission of dates, 402; why Erasmus was brought early into the monastic life, 403; reason of his bitter attacks on monks, 404; his early desire to devote himself to literary studies, 405; meaning and object of his *De Contemptu Mundi*, *ib.*; escape from his prison: secretary to Bishop of Cambrai, 406; sent to University of Paris, *ib.*; second visit to Paris: glimpses of the serious method and lighter incidents of his life there, 407; the Paris

WOR

landlady and her servant, 408; Erasmus tutor to Lord Mountjoy, 409; first visit to England: introduced, by Sir Thomas More, to the future Henry VIII., *ib.*; appreciation of England, 410; dread of a recall to his convent, *ib.*; adulatory solicitations for money addressed to the Lady of Vere, 411; ignoble stooping: 'Gnathonisms,' 412; his cherished project realized: takes his degree in Italy, 413; discards his monk's habit, 414; a bull-fight by machinery, *ib.*; his reception in Rome, *ib.*; invited to England by Henry VIII., *ib.*; the first mention of Luther, 416
Way, Mr. A. S., *The Letters of St. Paul to Seven Churches and Three Friends*, 475
Westcott, Bishop, 182 *sqq.*: great men in the line of English Bishops, 183; the good fortune of Durham: Lightfoot and Westcott, *ib.*; Westcott's early education: influence of Prince Lee, 184; at Cambridge: earnestness in work, 185; the work of the three friends, Lightfoot, Westcott, Hort, 186; Westcott and Hort's New Testament, 187; Westcott's Commentaries, 188; his characteristic method in them, 189; the influence of early Evangelical ideas, 191; he had no special training in philosophy, 192; his belief in the Incarnation, 193; how this led on to his Socialism, 194; his view of sin and evil, *ib.*; his sermons, 195; work as Bishop of Durham, *ib.*; relations with his clergy and people, 196
Wordsworth, Rev. Chr., *Ceremonies and Processions of the Cathedral Church of Salisbury*, 481
Workman, Mr. H. B., *The Dawn of the Reformation*, 494

408 ;
ount-
and :
fore,
ib. ;
410 ;
vent,
s for
dy of
ing :
cher-
s his
cards
bull-
s re-
ed to
ib. ;
416
f *St.*
and

great
glish
rtune
Vest-
luca-
Lee,
tness
f the
Vest-
and
187 ;
188 ,
hem,
t.van-
d no
phy,
urna-
o his
f sin
195 ;
ib. ;
and

onies
edral
Dawn